

# **MISSOURI**

# **SOLID WASTE ADVISORY BOARD**

**ANNUAL REPORT FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2019**

---

November 15, 2019

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Annual Report Requirement .....	1
What's in this Report .....	1
Prior SWAB Recommendations for Joint Committee Consideration .....	1
1.0 Technical Assistance Program .....	2
2.0 Solid Waste Management Issues.....	3
Funding.....	3
Recycling Infrastructure and Markets .....	3
Lack of Incentives to Invest in Recycling .....	3
Increase Investment to Develop End-Use Markets .....	4
Materials .....	4
Tires .....	5
Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) .....	5
Electronic Waste .....	5
Pharmaceuticals.....	6
Shingles .....	6
Glass.....	6
Lithium Ion Batteries.....	6
3.0 Proposed Rules and Regulations .....	7
4.0 Grant Award Criteria.....	8
Grant Award Criteria .....	8
Recycling Program Benefits.....	9
5.0 Waste Management Issues.....	9
Right to Repair.....	10
Market Development .....	10



Product Stewardship .....	10
Affordable recovery and recycling of illegally dumped tires.....	11
Inadequate Resources to Address Closed Landfills with Environmental Issues.....	11
<b>6.0 New Technologies and Improved Methods.....</b>	<b>11</b>
Local and State Policies .....	11
Food Waste .....	12
Organic Waste .....	12
Extended Producer Responsibility/Product Stewardship .....	12
<b>7.0 Unfunded Solid Waste Management Projects .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>8.0 Other Matters.....</b>	<b>13</b>
Extend Disposal Fee to Cover MDNR Expenses.....	13
Education/Awareness Programs to Reduce Contamination in Recycling .....	13
Local Control .....	14
Waste Diversion Goal .....	14
Waste Diversion Measurement.....	15
Maintain the Ban on Yard Waste in Landfills .....	15

Attachment A FY2017 District Funded Projects

Attachment B FY2017 District Unfunded Projects

Attachment C Proposed Revisions: 10 CSR 80-9.050 Solid Waste Management Fund—District Grants

Attachment D Spreadsheet of Missouri newspapers that publish three days or more per week



MISSOURI SOLID WASTE ADVISORY BOARD

## INTRODUCTION

### ANNUAL REPORT REQUIREMENT

With the passage of SB 445, the Legislature established a requirement that the Solid Waste Advisory Board (SWAB)<sup>1</sup> submit an annual report to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) on a number of subjects, including unfunded solid waste management projects. The act also requires the Board to prepare an annual report to committees in the General Assembly regarding solid waste. This report is intended to serve both purposes.

The statute requires that this report be prepared and issued on or before January 1<sup>st</sup>.

### WHAT'S IN THIS REPORT

SWAB is required to submit a report to MDNR or any standing, statutory, interim, or select committee or task force of the general assembly having jurisdiction over solid waste regarding:

- (1) The efficacy of its technical assistance program;
- (2) Solid waste management problems experienced by solid waste management districts;
- (3) The effects of proposed rules and regulations upon solid waste management within the districts;
- (4) Criteria to be used in awarding grants pursuant to section 260.335;
- (5) Waste management issues pertinent to the districts;
- (6) The development of improved methods of solid waste minimization, recycling and resource recovery;
- (7) Unfunded solid waste management projects; and
- (8) Such other matters as the advisory board may determine.

### PRIOR SWAB RECOMMENDATIONS FOR JOINT COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

SWAB previously identified selected issues for discussion and action by the Joint Committee. These issues, which were transmitted to the Joint Committee in January 2016, highlighted some of the more pressing challenges and opportunities facing the districts, and identify opportunities for expanding recycling in Missouri. These initial issues are repeated within this document.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Solid Waste Advisory Board (SWAB) is made up of the chairperson of each of the 20 Solid Waste Management Districts. Five additional members are appointed by the director of the Missouri Department of Natural Resources. Two represent the solid waste management industry, one represents the composting or recycling industry and the two remaining members are public members who have demonstrated interest in solid waste management issues.



## 1.0 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Since the passage of SB 530, the solid waste management districts have developed expertise and understanding around local solid waste management needs. However, waste management and recycling are national and global efforts. Many areas of the country, and the world, are ahead of Missouri in setting the tone for the future of waste and recycling. From anaerobic digestion to zero waste initiatives, other countries and U.S. cities and businesses are identifying new and innovative ways to manage wastes and advance the concept of a circular economy. To continue to advance planning in Missouri, it is essential that national and global trends be tracked and data disseminated.

MDNR can play a vital role in ensuring that the districts have the research and data needed for good planning and implementation at the local level. State leadership is critical on two levels:

1. Regulatory issues like illegal dumping, permitting for solid waste disposal and processing facilities, and enforcement actions.
2. Analysis of data, trends and innovations in all areas of integrated solid waste management, not only landfills.

MDNR does not currently have a technical assistance program for waste reduction and recycling programs, which could be highly beneficial for both districts and recycling in general. Individual districts do not have the resources to conduct this research and create this programming on their own. With over 50% of Missouri waste now being managed by means other than landfilling, there are significant benefits that could occur through an active Technical Assistance Program.

Within a Technical Assistance Program, MDNR could:

- Conduct research
- Collect and disseminate program data
- Provide training and certifications
- Conduct educational programs
- Investigate best practices for recycling issues, promote public awareness
- Maintain database and informational resources

In the 2016 annual report, SWAB recommended that MDNR begin to establish a program during 2017. The following recommendations are again repeated in this report.

The first step would be to establish a Waste Reduction and Recycling Unit within the MDNR Solid Waste Management Program. As a suggestion, the unit could include two recycling specialists, planner II, research analyst, and a unit chief. This would greatly increase the ability of MDNR to be proactive in providing information and assistance to support Districts and others working to expand recycling throughout the state.

Establishing a recycling unit and creating the associated positions would allow MDNR to better accomplish its mission to expand waste reduction and recycling in Missouri. SWAB encourages MDNR to initiate an effective and efficient waste reduction and recycling technical assistance program. Statewide solid waste planning and technical assistance could be further enhanced by establishing deliberate policy, planning and outreach linkages with other statewide programs related to topics such as air and water quality, energy efficiency and conservation and natural hazard mitigation.



## 2.0 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

The districts were each asked to select one or two waste management issues facing their district for inclusion in this report. Most of the issues identified by the districts fall into the following categories:

- Funding
- Recycling infrastructure and markets
- Material specific issues

### FUNDING

The current Missouri tonnage fee of \$2.11 per ton is a sustainable commitment that funds the recycling and waste reduction activities of the districts. The fee was initially set at \$1.50 per ton, with a Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustment for inflation. By 2005, the fee had risen to \$2.11 per ton, but the CPI adjustment was frozen through additional legislation and will continue to remain at \$2.11 per ton until 2027.

Of the total tonnage fee, only \$1.28 is currently available to support the recycling and waste reduction efforts of the state, with the remaining going towards regulation and enforcement activities of MDNR.

Like many other public agencies, the districts are consistently being asked to do more with less. This is especially true in rural areas where the quantity of recyclable materials and logistics make collecting and processing recyclables difficult. The end result is that geographically, large areas of the state are left without reasonable means to recycle and the districts have inadequate resources and staff to support the necessary infrastructure.

One method of maintaining the power of solid waste funds would be to index the tipping fee to the Consumer Price Index. This action, which would represent a return to previous solid waste policy, will provide the districts and MDNR with a hedge against inflation and rising operation expenses.

### RECYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE AND MARKETS

#### LACK OF INCENTIVES TO INVEST IN RECYCLING

Recycling only works when there are businesses to buy the collected materials and reprocess them. Much of the material collected in Missouri is delivered to markets outside of the state. National recycling markets have experienced a downward trend, depressing the business of recycling and driving some recycling enterprises out of business.

The global recycling market is currently struggling due to actions taken by China to reduce the volume of contaminated recovered materials being shipped to that country. Chinese authorities banned the import of mixed paper and most scrap plastics by the end of 2017. Further restrictions on imports were initiated in 2018 with announcements made that China may completely ban imports of recovered fiber and every other form of "solid waste" by 2020. The growing trade war between the U.S. and China will also likely result in higher tariffs on recovered materials being exported by the U.S. China was one of the world's foremost importers of recyclable material and our domestic markets have struggled to absorb the materials that have been banned. This ban is adversely affecting recycling programs across the U.S. and in Missouri until the recycling industry is able to adjust and find other domestic and international markets. Initially, overseas shipments were sent to India, Thailand and



Vietnam, but shipping costs are much higher to these countries. And after several months of being overwhelmed by material diverted from the Chinese market, these countries have also started placing restrictions on imports of recovered materials. Efforts are being made in Missouri and throughout the country to reduce contamination in recycling in order to meet China's stricter standards and to improve recycling processes overall. In March, China placed a 0.5 percent contamination limit on the loads it is accepting.

The impacts of the National Sword policy are being felt in Missouri. In St. Louis, one of the two single-stream recycling processing facilities announced that it would no longer accept single-stream residential recyclable materials on November 1, 2018. This is creating a temporary shortage of processing capacity in the region. Service interruptions are not anticipated, though some materials will be shipped out of the region for processing at other Midwestern MRF's for some period of time. This will cause increases in recycling costs in the region, though recycling service providers anticipate that market conditions will improve in 2020. There is also a district-funded regional education campaign underway to address contamination issues in single-stream recycling collection systems. In addition to vigorous education and outreach efforts, consideration is also underway regarding various collection program modifications to improve the marketability of recovered materials. Some modifications being considered include eliminating glass from single-stream collection as well as alternating collections to collect fibers one week and containers the next week, as well as investigating dual-stream collection systems.

Several of the more rural districts are dealing with aging infrastructure and often the local sheltered workshop serves as the recycling processor for the region. In many instances, the sheltered workshops have stopped accepting certain recyclable materials; limiting the list of materials they accept to paper, cardboard and aluminum. Recently some workshops have closed their doors, while others have halted all recycling operations.

The depressed market, along with the lack of infrastructure, creates limited financial incentives for businesses to expand their recycling efforts. Unless the product is very clean, there simply is nowhere to take what is collected.

## INCREASE INVESTMENT TO DEVELOP END-USE MARKETS

Making new products from recycled materials is a strong economic development opportunity that can generate good-paying Missouri jobs. However, the Missouri Market Development Program has very limited funding. Program resources should be significantly increased to support the growth of end-users in Missouri. Recycling produces commodities that feed into a global marketplace, and are subject to fluctuations in price and demand. Developing strong, local end-use markets for recovered materials generated in Missouri would help recyclers weather market fluctuations. Expanding the Missouri Market Development program administered by the Environmental Improvement and Energy Resources Authority (EIERA) would create local jobs and provide a significant return on investment. The Market Development Program needs much greater resources to help recycling continue to grow through the creation of value-added products made in Missouri.

## MATERIALS

The districts have often provided the only opportunity to the general public for the safe and environmentally responsible disposal of tires, household hazardous waste, electronics, and other items not appropriate to landfill. In general, these materials are difficult to manage, expensive to properly take care of, and lack the needed policies and/or fees to create incentives for residents and the solid waste industry to properly handle them. This situation leaves the cost of proper disposal on the districts, local governments, and the state. The districts identified the following materials as problematic.



---

## TIRES

Illegal disposal of scrap tires continues to be an issue for the state. Scrap tire stockpiles are unsightly, pose a fire hazard, and provide breeding grounds for mosquitoes and vermin. While MDNR works with charitable, fraternal, and other nonprofit organizations to complete the necessary cleanup work for sites with less than 500 tires; illegal scrap tire stockpiles cost municipalities and private property owners significant dollars each year to clean up.

The elimination of the Scrap Tire Roundup Program in April of 2016 was distressing to many of the rural districts. The districts continue to address scrap tires as best they can, but as end markets for scrap tires continue to dry up, it is likely that scrap tires will continue to remain an issue for the districts with stockpiles growing and no ways or means to address the problem.

---

## HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE (HHW)

There is a continued need across the state for convenient access to programs for the proper management of HHW, which includes products such as household cleaners, lawn and garden products, automotive fluids, paints and paint-related products.

Several districts currently provide HHW collection programs to varying degrees ranging from one-day collection events to semi-permanent and permanent facilities. Most districts also agree that one-day collection events can be costly and offer a very limited window of opportunity for participation. Districts that do not offer programs often find it difficult to find locations, support and funding for facilities and events.

Those districts that offer HHW collection programs find that latex and oil based paints often make up the greatest HHW expense. Paint creates issues for all HHW facilities in the state and each facility has had to deal with it in different ways. Nine states have adopted product stewardship legislation for paint via an industry backed and funded organization, Paintcare. Implementing product stewardship legislation and programming would free up funds for other waste diversion activities, make paint recycling more convenient for residents, and help Missouri gain experience with a successful product stewardship program.

---

## ELECTRONIC WASTE

Electronic waste continues to be a growing problem. Rapid advances in technology mean that electronic products are becoming obsolete more quickly. This, coupled with explosive sales in consumer electronics, means that more products are being disposed of, even if they still work.

Recycling electronics is not like recycling traditional recyclables. These products are not easy to recycle. For example, monitors and televisions made with tubes (not flat panels) contain lead and proper and safe recycling is costly.

In rural areas, the cost associated with electronics recycling is a hindrance for many residents. As stated by one district "there are too many opportunities to store or dump the materials on one's property."

For the past few years, the Missouri Recycling Association (MORA) has been developing the "Electronic Products Recycling and Reuse Act," which relies on extended producer responsibility (EPR) to offset the costs of electronic waste recycling. With an EPR strategy, electronics manufacturers would be responsible for partially financing a



collection and recycling infrastructure in Missouri. The SWAB supports MORA's efforts to develop this legislation.

## PHARMACEUTICALS

The proper disposal of pharmaceuticals is becoming an issue in some regions, particularly those with numerous medical centers and an aging population. Almost all medicines can be safely disposed of through U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA)-authorized collection events; however, these events are periodic and may not reach all areas of the state. Other options for pharmaceutical management, such as HHW collection programs are not well known to residents, are costly for districts to fund, and cannot accept all pharmaceuticals such as narcotics and opiates due to federal drug enforcement rules.

## SHINGLES

Asphalt is one of the most common materials used in roofing shingles and as such shingles have the potential for reuse in public paving projects. Where options exist for shingle recycling, the districts are challenged to promote these programs, because from a roofer's perspective, recycling shingles is more expensive and time consuming than taking them to the area landfills.

However, some of the districts are noting an increase in shingle disposal. Some of the asphalt companies have decreased the amount of shingles they purchase or have eliminated the purchase of shingles altogether. While the reason for the decline is not fully known, it is likely that:

- The decline in oil prices has reduced incentives to incorporate shingles into paving mixes.
- The paving industry has not rebounded quite as fast as construction, in general.

This also points to a larger challenge – construction/demolition waste, in general. Some components of this waste stream (drywall, some wood, metals) are well managed – other aspects, such as shingles, still need attention.

## GLASS

Glass is increasingly being eliminated from single-stream recycling programs due to the added expense of glass contamination in other recyclables and the cost of equipment damage. Through the efforts of Ripple Glass, LLC (Kansas City), several regional "hubs" have been established throughout most of the state that collect and pool glass that Ripple transports at their expense with a 25-ton required minimum shipment. A few communities are experiencing difficulty in being able to construct and operate regional "bunkers" to pool nearby glass for transporting with Ripple. There is little revenue for glass locally and transportation costs due to weight and distance are a deterrent to other glass recycling options.

With the current trending away from single-use plastic, glass is becoming an attractive alternative. It also remains the packaging of choice for many existing products; therefore, efforts to continue to facilitate and grow the regional services for glass recycling are seen as an important component in the successful management of this particular waste stream.

## LITHIUM ION BATTERIES

Lithium-ion batteries are rechargeable batteries and are used as a source of power primarily in electronics such as



smartphones, laptops and tablets. Their share of the battery market is growing due to the increasing demand for portable consumer electronics. Their market share is also expected to continue to grow because of their potential use in the automotive sector (electric/hybrid vehicles).

Safety of lithium-based batteries, however, has attracted much attention over the past few years. They have caused fires in hoverboards, laptops and phones.

As the use of these batteries grows, their presence in the waste stream is expected to grow. Their safety risk also extends to disposal. Because lithium-ion batteries retain some amount of charge when they are “dead,” they have been suspected of causing fires in the back of trash and recycling trucks, where the batteries can be damaged during transport and exposed to other chemicals. Known as “hot loads,” these incidences can jeopardize the health and safety of the driver and public, and can damage personal property and collection vehicles. They also pose a threat to a landfill, if undetected.

SWAB continues to evaluate the need for legislative action to manage the risks of lithium-ion battery disposal.

### 3.0 PROPOSED RULES AND REGULATIONS

In January 2017, then Governor Greitens signed Executive Order 17-03, requiring Missouri agencies to conduct a review of all existing and proposed regulations. In July, Governor Greitens announced the launch of an initiative (NoMORedTape) for Missourians to submit recommendations for action to cut government red tape.

In this spirit of reducing red tape, the districts reviewed the rules and procedures that govern how a solid waste district receives and manages its portion of the Missouri Solid Waste Management Fund (aka, “The District Grant Rule”) and the General Terms and Conditions.

In reviewing the grant rule and terms and conditions, the districts looked to ease the administrative burden on districts and to update outdated regulatory language. The amount of paper, forms, reports, and duplication can become both a distraction from focusing on our mission and a deterrent to potential grant applicants. Streamlining MDNR WMP and district requirements and policies has the potential to create efficiencies, improve accountability, increase partnership between districts and SWMP, and create a more engaged workforce with more time to focus on the mission of WMP.

The revisions suggested by SWAB were provided as an attachment to the 2017 annual report. They were also submitted directly through the [nomoredtape.com](http://nomoredtape.com) site established by the Governor. A copy is included as Attachment C.

Another issue that has come to light is the growing problem of finding daily newspapers to place advertising as required by State statute. Newspapers are closing throughout the state and it is becoming increasingly difficult to meet the advertising requirements outlined in statute and referenced in the grant terms and conditions. Further, the costs associated with newspapers that are available continue to increase. This availability problem is especially acute in rural areas where daily newspapers are rare to begin with and there may only be one or two daily papers in a multi-county area. The Missouri State Office of Administration (OA) oversees the advertising guidelines for state funds and OA defines daily as seven days per week. According to the Missouri Press Association there are only 12 daily newspapers in the state that meet this criteria. OA proposed a legislative change last year to change those requirements. However, to date, no progress has been made in this area though a similar proposal may be



made again this year. As more people rely on social media and less on traditional newspapers for information and public notices, changes need to be made to keep up with the technological and social media changes occurring in how citizens access news. A spreadsheet of newspapers that the Missouri Press Association considers "daily" papers (published three or more days a week) is included in Attachment D.

The Waste Management Program (WMP) continues to work through the process to promulgate a rule revision to adopt the Federal coal combustion residuals (CCR) rules. In 2018 the Missouri Legislature passed Senate Bill 917, which was signed into law on June 1, 2018. This bill provides the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) with the authority to promulgate rules pertaining to CCR. The law also provides funding to be used by MDNR to administer the rule. Prior to the passage of this law, MDNR used the Solid Waste Management Fund to cover department costs for CCR landfill oversight.

In order to comply with the Red Tape Reduction Initiative (RTI), the WMP continues to revise regulations governing municipal solid waste landfills, demolition landfills, and processing facilities in accordance with Section 536.175 of Missouri state statute. To date seven rules have been rescinded and 12 more are being updated as part of this process. As the RTI rule updates reach their final steps and the CCR rules progress, WMP will begin working on additional rules as staff resources are freed up. The WMP began the rulemaking review process on the rules governing solid waste management districts during the first part of 2019.

SWAB has identified administrative streamlining as a top priority in recommendations made to the department. This includes implementing legislative changes enacted in 2015, which would greatly reduce excessive administrative burdens on districts. This important first step will facilitate additional regulatory and administrative procedures streamlining that will yield significant benefits. Streamlining can result in generation of significant additional revenues, save hundreds of thousands of dollars in administrative expenses, greatly speed up project implementation, and free up DNR staff time that could be dedicated to a much needed SWMP Recycling Unit. Streamlining efforts were proscribed in the 2015 legislative revisions, and this opportunity for significant red tape reduction needs to occur in 2019.

## 4.0 GRANT AWARD CRITERIA

### GRANT AWARD CRITERIA

The grant award criteria are established in state statute and include 19 criteria that districts must consider when awarding grants. Current criteria for awarding grants is established in 10 CSR 80-9.040(5)(C) and include the following core criteria:

1. Conformance with the integrated waste management hierarchy as described in the Missouri Policy on Resource Recovery, as incorporated by reference in this rule;
2. Conformance with the State Targeted Materials List;
3. Degree to which the project contributes to community based economic development;
4. Degree to which funding to the project will adversely affect existing entities in the market segment;
5. Degree to which the project promotes waste reduction or recycling through the proposed process;
6. Demonstration of cooperative efforts through a public/private partnership or among political subdivisions;
7. Compliance with federal, state or local requirements;
8. Transferability of results;
9. The statewide need for the information;



10. Technical ability of the applicant;
11. Managerial ability of the applicant;
12. Ability to implement in a timely manner;
13. Technical feasibility;
14. Availability of commitments necessary to conduct the project;
15. Level of commitment for financing;
16. Type of contribution by applicant;
17. Effectiveness and quality of marketing strategy;
18. Quality of budget; and
19. Selected financial ratios.

SWAB has reviewed the criteria and makes the following suggestions:

- Rewriting criterion number 4 to make it easier to evaluate: Degree to which the project will result in improvement or expansion of services. Districts do not have the ability to forecast how the market segment of an existing entity will be impacted by a grant award.
- Eliminating criterion number 6. While partnerships can be beneficial, they are not always necessary for the success of a project. This criterion can be detrimental to the scoring single-entity projects.
- Eliminating criterion number 8. Missouri is a diverse state and not all projects will show potential for transferability to other regions. While transferability can be beneficial, it should not be necessary.
- Eliminating criterion number 9. When asked, most districts did not understand the criterion nor how it should be applied when evaluating grant applications.
- Combining criterion 9 with criterion 10, which eliminates the need for a separate evaluation of an applicant's technical and managerial abilities.
- Eliminating criterion 16. Not all districts require match funding from applicants.
- Eliminating criterion 17. Not all grants require a marketing strategy.
- Eliminating criterion 19. Districts are required to obtain bond ratings from cities and three years of financial reports from applicants seeking funding over \$50,000. This requirement is vague and provides no guidance as to its implementation.

## RECYCLING PROGRAM BENEFITS

There tends to be an emphasis on tonnages diverted from landfilling when evaluating the success of recycling programs. Other measurable impacts include participation rates, jobs created and jobs maintained, state and local tax revenues generated, landfill volume reductions, greenhouse gas reductions, resources conserved, etc. The number of tons diverted from disposal has been the only program measure for many years, and it has become insufficient as the only measure. There are numerous other ways to measure the benefits of recycling programs, and it is time to implement additional ways to measure program benefits.

## 5.0 WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

The districts were each asked to select one or two waste management issues facing their district for inclusion in this report. The issues identified by the districts include:

- Right to Repair
- Market Development
- Product Stewardship
- Affordable recovery and recycling of illegally dumped tires



- Closed landfills

## RIGHT TO REPAIR

It's inevitable. The things we own stop working or break. Getting broken items repaired is becoming more challenging as consumers rarely have the ability to repair their own items or have them repaired at an independent repair shop. While many manufacturers allow consumers and local repair shops to fix their products, there are others that are making it more difficult by not releasing repair manuals, using proprietary fasteners or not making parts available.

Making repairs difficult means that many consumers will choose to replace the item and send the broken item to the landfill.

Right to repair laws typically require manufacturers to publish repair manuals and sell the parts, diagnostic software, and tools needed to fix their products. The goal of these laws is to ensure consumers can repair their own items, or pay an independent repair shop to do so. Several states over the past year, Missouri included, introduced legislation that would require manufacturers of electronic equipment to sell repair parts and release service information to consumers.

SWAB is supportive of actions that improve access to repair to keep products in service and out of the waste stream.

## MARKET DEVELOPMENT

Creating new products from recovered materials provides a great economic development opportunity for Missouri. This has never been more true since China implemented the "National Sword" policy in 2018. This policy resulted in the elimination of one of the major markets for recyclable materials collected in Missouri. This has led to big short term increases in recycling processing expenses that are being felt throughout Missouri and the entire country. As a result, the recycling industry is scrambling to develop alternative markets for recovered materials. An aggressive effort by Missouri in response to this challenge and opportunity would better position Missouri recyclers to weather future market fluctuations and create additional Missouri recycling jobs.

There will only be a short time frame available to take advantage of this opportunity and Missouri would need to move fast. There is a Market Development program in place, administered by the Environmental Improvement and Energy Resources Authority (EIERA). Unfortunately, the program is seriously underfunded, and receives only \$800,000.00 per year. This is not enough to make a big impact, and a significant increase in funding over several years would allow Missouri to be competitive in attracting end-users to our state. An aggressive recruitment effort would also be needed, which would be greatly enhanced by collaboration with the Department of Economic Development and other business expansion resources that Missouri has to offer. This is a great opportunity for those that can act swiftly and collaboratively.

## PRODUCT STEWARDSHIP

Across the United States and in other countries, Product Stewardship is coming into use as another tool to help manage specific waste streams and hard-to-handle materials. Product Stewardship is an environmental management strategy that means whoever designs, produces, sells, or uses a product, takes responsibility for



minimizing the product's environmental impact throughout all stages of the products' life cycle, including end of life management. Currently local governments and taxpayers pay for the end-of-life management of these products through their recycling fees and property taxes. Product Stewardship allows us to move from back-of-the-pipe efforts such as recycling to front-of-the-pipe solutions that can be much more effective. Product Stewardship also provides a long-term solution to manage waste products by shifting the responsibility for collection, transportation, and management of products away from local governments to the manufacturers who introduce those products into the marketplace. A solid waste district-funded program began in 2018 to develop and apply the principles of product stewardship to Missouri's waste stream. The current focus of the council is on paint, pharmaceuticals and mattresses.

### AFFORDABLE RECOVERY AND RECYCLING OF ILLEGALLY DUMPED TIRES

The end of the Missouri Vocational Enterprises (MVE) recycling program and MDNR's Scrap Tire Roundup program have had a very negative impact on many of the districts that used these programs. The state needs to consider reinstating these or similar programs in order to address the need for affordable tire recovery and recycling. The state also should take steps to develop markets for scrap tires in order to make these viable programs. The state generates 5 million scrap tires a year. These old tires pose a number of risks including fire and disease (including Zika).

### INADEQUATE RESOURCES TO ADDRESS CLOSED LANDFILLS WITH ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Currently, landfills permitted in Missouri are required to include closure plans and provide financial assurance mechanisms to properly close the landfill and provide for post-closure maintenance and monitoring. However, many older landfills or "dumps," which have been closed or abandoned for years, do not have these mechanisms in place to mitigate risks to the public and the environment.

Furthermore, many of these older sites have yet to be identified and the risks categorized by MDNR. It is likely, however, that each county in Missouri has a legacy of closed and abandoned landfill sites.

There has been much discussion of late to establish a fund to enable MDNR to remediate hazards posed by these closed or abandoned landfills. SWAB will continue to be a part of the discussion as to how this fund could be created; how a complete inventory of closed/abandoned disposal sites throughout Missouri can be created; and the role of various organizations in creating a fund, administering resources, and mitigating hazards.

## 6.0 NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND IMPROVED METHODS

New technologies and improved methods to use or recycle materials that would otherwise be waste must be part of a continued discussion in Missouri.

### LOCAL AND STATE POLICIES

Recycling and waste minimization have an inherent economic disadvantage to landfilling in Missouri, for an average resident it is simply easier and cheaper to landfill items that could otherwise be diverted to a better use. Policies, fees, regulations, and incentives create a more level playing field for waste reduction, from product stewardship legislation to local governments including curbside recycling in their solid waste fee instead of offering



it as a separate and optional service. Relying on people's good intentions, more convenient recycling, and new technology to increase waste diversion will only go so far. Monetary incentives and enforcement are needed to change behavior, such as, pay as you throw programs and landfill bans for both residents and businesses for certain materials. We will continue to see a slow growth rate for waste diversion until state and local governments begin implementing legislation, policies, and programs that make waste diversion a priority.

## FOOD WASTE

The national movement to reduce food waste presents an opportunity for waste diversion and economic growth in Missouri. Missouri has institutions and businesses that produce large amounts of food waste and plenty of rural areas ideal for composting operations and opportunity for distributing products to farming operations. These factors coupled with the growing popularity of local and organic produce create an untapped opportunity for Missouri.

The districts and MDNR should be working together to identify strategies for households, businesses, and government to reduce food waste and to provide recommendations for state and local government for setting targets for reduction, providing direction and infrastructure to enable food waste prevention programs, creating incentives for donation programs, and providing education about prevention.

## ORGANIC WASTE

Organic waste, both food and yard waste, is one of the few recoverable materials that can be collected in our state, processed into a product in our state, and sold to customers in our state. It is important for Missouri to continue to develop and expand organics markets to allow organics processing to remain competitive with disposal.

The ban on landfilling of yard waste has made a significant contribution to helping the state achieve its waste diversion goals. The districts support continuation of this yard waste ban, effective since 1992, to divert yard waste materials from landfills and support the organics recycling industry to achieve greater diversion of these and other organic materials through recycling and composting.

## EXTENDED PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY/PRODUCT STEWARDSHIP

Product stewardship is where environmental, health, and safety protection centers on the product itself. Everyone involved in the lifespan of the product—manufacturers, retailers, users, and disposers—are responsible for its environmental, health, and safety impacts. For manufacturers, this includes planning for, and if necessary, paying for the recycling or disposal of the product at the end of its useful life. For retailers and consumers, this means taking an active role in ensuring the proper disposal or recycling a product at end of life. For example, in Missouri, when an individual purchases new tires or a new automotive battery, he simultaneously pays for the disposal of those tires and that battery. Product Stewardship provides an infrastructure for the disposal or recycling of the product.

Missouri has an opportunity to foster product stewardship, especially as it relates to waste management by undertaking cooperative efforts with manufacturers, retailers and others to increase recycling of discarded products such as electronics, mattresses, carpet, paint, pharmaceuticals, fluorescent lighting, and mercury thermostats. Missouri can learn from other states that have developed, or are developing take-back mandates for selected products leading to cost-effective approaches to handling problem products and wastes. This approach



will reduce the burden on Missouri taxpayers to manage these problem wastes at the expense of local governments by building a sustainable infrastructure to dispose of these items at the end of their usable life funded and managed by the manufacturers and retailers.

## 7.0 UNFUNDDED SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROJECTS

In FY2017, the districts funded 217 projects totaling more than \$5,204,161. The districts also leveraged more than \$1,880,203 in match and project funds. For the same time period, the districts report that 63 projects requesting more than \$1,765,970 were unfunded. Many of these projects were not funded because the districts determined that the grant applications were incomplete or the projects would not lead to significant diversion of recyclable materials. The districts reported that 28 projects requesting more than \$1,377,527 were unfunded due to insufficient resources available to the district. However, not all districts reported a reason for not funding some projects and many projects were partially funded as a means to stretch grant resources.

A summary of district funded and unfunded projects is provided as Attachments A and B to this report.

## 8.0 OTHER MATTERS

### EXTEND DISPOSAL FEE TO COVER MDNR EXPENSES

In the 2017 annual report, the SWAB recommended that utility waste landfills should be charged fees to cover the regulatory expense of MDNR oversight. Up until this year, these landfills paid no fees to MDNR and all the costs incurred by MDNR in regulating these facilities were absorbed by the State Solid Waste Fund. This issue has been addressed by the passage of Senate Bill 917, which established fees to be paid by utility waste landfills to cover the cost of regulatory activities carried out by MDNR. This will free up funds to be used for their original purpose – to reduce the amount of municipal solid waste going to landfills.

### EDUCATION/AWARNESS PROGRAMS TO REDUCE CONTAMINATION IN RECYCLING

The closure of foreign markets for recovered materials has not only resulted in problems with markets for recyclable materials, it has highlighted the need to focus on “cleaning up” recycling programs. There have always been problems with contamination in recycling collection programs, but the poor quality of materials being shipped overseas is the reason why those markets have closed to U.S. shipments of recyclables. It has become very clear that domestic programs need to return to the basics on educating the public on what is a recoverable material and what is trash. SWAB strongly recommends that both the districts and MDNR put more emphasis on and resources toward providing public education and awareness programs to improve the quality of the recyclable commodities being collected. It is not enough to just encourage citizens to reduce, reuse and recycle – they must be educated on how to recover recyclables properly; what can and cannot be recycled; and why it is so important that contamination be avoided.

In response to the recycling market doldrums, MDNR has allocated \$240,000 from the Waste Tire Education Fund for use to bolster recycling efforts and success across the state. The message will be to continue to recycle and to make a special effort to reduce contamination in the materials we recycle. This program is designed to



complement existing or planned local/district educational efforts. Working with the MO Broadcasters Association (MBA), \$200,000 will be spent on 11,200 thirty-second radio spots at several hundred member stations, blanketing approximately 80 – 82 percent of the state. This represents a leveraged buy of an approximate \$800,000 “retail” value for MDNR. In addition, should any of the stations have extra air time during the campaign that time will be given to this campaign (at no additional cost to MDNR) resulting in extra spots. So the 11,200 and \$800,000 numbers are minimum value numbers. MBA will handle and absorb all production costs. In addition, \$40,000 will be distributed to the minimally funded districts for their use for basic educational materials, (signage, brochures, etc.) as needed. The campaign will run for 90 days.

## LOCAL CONTROL

Local support of recycling through regional solid waste management districts has been a key factor in the growth and success of recycling in Missouri. Maintaining and strengthening local control will ensure the best use of resources and the implementation of projects best suited for local needs in a highly diverse state like Missouri. Local control and development is especially important for sustaining recycling programs in the rural areas of the state where economies of scale, transportation costs and smaller populations make recycling and waste reduction programs especially challenging. SWAB believes that many Missouri citizens wish to have the opportunity to recycle and additional efforts need to be made to find innovative ways to foster the growth of rural waste reduction, composting, and recycling programs.

## WASTE DIVERSION GOAL

In 1990, Missouri established a 40 percent waste diversion goal. Recycling has become a significant statewide industry that has created thousands of jobs, in addition to improving communities and protecting our environment. Increasing our diversion goal to 75 percent will generate additional economic growth and improve communities across Missouri. Missouri has about 25,000 recycling jobs, and increased recycling can create thousands of additional jobs.

Actions to move Missouri towards the 75 percent diversion goal include:

- Education and outreach that focuses on the opportunity that increased waste diversion brings to Missouri. Efforts should target solid waste districts, municipal decision makers, legislators, businesses and the public.
- Emphasis on specific items in the waste stream that can provide the greatest impact. Five large-volume commodities have been identified that, when diverted, will add considerable additional tonnage toward the goal of 75 percent. Extensive research has been completed by the Missouri Recycling Association to identify current infrastructure and potential strategies for diversion of each of five commodities that include e-scrap, construction and demolition waste, paint, textiles, and organics. Education and outreach will focus on the opportunities that increasing waste diversion brings to Missouri and by working with stakeholder groups, we can collectively determine the best strategies for each of the targeted commodities. These strategies include producer responsibility programs, growing end markets, education and outreach, and promoting participation in other state and national programs. A common element for each commodity will be action steps that both businesses and individuals can take to reduce, reuse and minimize the need to landfill each target commodity. This component is especially important in rural regions where recycling options are limited or non-existent.



## WASTE DIVERSION MEASUREMENT

In 1990, Missouri adopted a statewide waste diversion goal of 40% by 1998. According to measurements by MDNR, the state achieved 40% diversion in 2001. MDNR measures diversion through a calculation of the amount of waste that would be expected to be placed in final disposal (i.e., generated) compared to the amount actually placed in final disposal.

For the disposal estimate, MDNR tracks the amount of waste disposed in Missouri landfills, waste transported out of state for disposal, and estimates the amount of waste imported into the state for disposal.

The most challenging aspect of determining waste diversion estimates continues to be the accurate assessment of the amount of waste generated. MDNR has used two methods to estimate the amount of waste generated:

- From 1990 to 1999, MDNR used a fixed generation rate of 1.47 tons/person multiplied by annual population estimates to determine waste generation. Using this methodology, the state calculated the diversion rate to be 24% in 1999.
- In 1999, MDNR switched to a variable generation rate that reflects the state of the economy. The variable generation rate uses Personal Consumption Expenditures (PCE) in which waste generated in 1990 was divided by PCE for 1990 to derive an index by which subsequent years' PCE values may be multiplied. The 1999 diversion rate was recalculated by MDNR to be 36% in 1999 using the variable generation rate. The 2017 diversion rate has been calculated to be approximately 63%.

SWAB believes that the current waste diversion rate methodology used by MDNR overestimates the state's diversion rate. SWAB encourages DNR to continue to evaluate waste diversion methodologies and recommends implementing any possible improvements to the diversion methodology as appropriate to improve the accuracy of the diversion calculations. It is also time to implement additional program evaluation tools, including measures such as economic impacts, conservation and energy saving impacts, and greenhouse gas reductions. Tons of waste diverted as the only program measure is no longer adequate to communicate the benefits of waste reduction and recycling programs in Missouri.

## MAINTAIN THE BAN ON YARD WASTE IN LANDFILLS

Composting has tremendous environmental benefits, and also has created thousands of Missouri jobs. Organic materials in landfills emit millions of tons of methane every year in Missouri, and composting greatly reduces this huge pollution source. Allowing yard waste back into landfills would have tremendous negative impacts on the environment and economy in Missouri. Keeping other organic wastes out of the landfills would also create additional economic opportunities for Missouri, and further reduce toxic landfill gas emissions.



## ATTACHMENT A

## FY2019 DISTRICT FUNDED PROJECTS



MISSOURI SOLID WASTE ADVISORY BOARD

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
A	District A Plan Implementation (PI)	\$7,500.00	\$7,500.00	\$0	\$0	\$7,500.00	Funding for two composting workshops, HHW outreach and website support.	
A	City of Albany	\$4,423.00	\$4,421.54	\$934.00	\$1.46	\$5,357.00	Funds the purchase and shipping of 20 recycling containers and recycling bags to be placed in parks in the City of Albany.	
A	Northwest Missouri Regional Council of Governments	\$11,242.00	\$11,242.00	\$825.74	\$0	\$12,067.74	Funds contractual services for vendor to pick up and dispose of HHW materials and provide replacement containers.	
A	Northwest Missouri Regional Council of Governments	\$19,500.00	\$19,500.00	\$17,400.00	\$0	\$36,900.00	Funds the purchase of a horizontal baler to assist recycling efforts at NWMSU.	
A	Northwest Missouri Regional Council of Governments	\$19,500.00	\$19,500.00	\$13,791.00	\$0	\$33,291.00	Funds the purchase of a perforator to assist recycling efforts at NWMSU.	
B	NMSWMD – Region B PI	\$26,500.00	\$26,500.00	\$0	\$0	\$26,500.00	This grant funds the goals of the solid waste management plan including district collections.	
B	Grundy County Commission	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00	\$0	\$0	\$3,500.00	Project allows the county to transport trailer to four of the smaller communities within Grundy County that don't have access to recycling, then transport recyclables to a processing facility.	
B	High Hope Recycling & Paper Shredding	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$0	\$0	\$20,000.00	Purchase a cross-cut shredder to increase their shredding program, a trailer to collect recyclables and additional bins for their recycling program.	
B	Hope Haven Industries, Inc.	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$0	\$0	\$20,000.00	Purchase of a used semitractor to transport recyclables to a processing facility.	
C	City of Kirksville	\$35,000.00	\$35,000.00	\$11,667.00	\$0	\$46,667.00	Purchase recycled content furniture for Aquatic Park.	

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
C	Industrial Opportunities, Inc.	\$30,500.00	\$30,500.00	\$0	\$0	\$30,500.00	Purchase of two new balers to keep up with current and growing recycling needs.	
C	City of Memphis	\$24,900.00	\$24,900.00	\$10,100.00	\$0	\$35,000.00	Purchase new conveyor and build new loading dock to increase recycling productivity.	
D	Region D Plan Implementation - 2019	\$26,130.00	\$26,130.00	\$0	\$0	\$26,130.00	Funding request allows the District Plan to be managed, practiced and executed. Staff (1) ½ time salary, annual dinner meeting expense, refreshments for meetings, mileage and grant call public notices. MORA conference expenses associated with and membership dues.	
D	Andrew County	\$21,424.00	\$21,424.26	\$0	\$0	\$21,424.00	Salary for two part-time employees to manage recycling drop off center and mobile unit.	
D	Clinco Sheltered Industries	\$27,108.00	\$27,108.00	\$3,012.00		\$30,120.00	Recycling bins for all the city/county recycling programs..	
D	Region D Recycling & Waste Management District	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$0	\$0	\$3,000.00	Recycling programs support. Support area recycling programs with supplies, education, media coverage, etc.	
E	Region E Plan Implementation	\$234,864.00	\$234,864.00	\$0	\$0	\$234,864.00	Plan Implementation for district outreach activities.	
E	Region E	\$146,525.00	\$41,213.00	\$0	\$0	\$41,213.00	Plan implementation for district solid waste planning and sponsorship program.	
E	Region E	\$130,710.00	\$130,710.00	\$0	\$0	\$130,710.00	Plan Implementation for regional HHW program.	
E	Bridging The Gap	\$85,995.00	\$85,995.00	\$21,195.00	\$0	\$107,190.00	Salary for consulting with a minimum of 15 businesses for startup or expansion of recycling/composting programs.	

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
E	City of Lee's Summit	\$42,189.00	\$42,189.00	\$10,547.00	\$0	\$52,736.00	Containers to support re-opening of community drop-off recycling center.	
E	Ripple Glass	\$24,000.00	\$18,000.00	\$4,500.00	\$0	\$22,500.00	Educational video describing glass recycling process.	District elected to not fund social media campaign
E	Wright Brothers Glass Recycling	\$30,794.00	\$30,794.00	\$7,669.00	\$0	\$38,463.00	Trailer and truck to support curbside glass recycling business.	
E	ScrapsKC	\$45,428.00	\$45,428.00	\$11,357.00	\$0	\$56,785.00	Purchase of precious plastics machine and salary to manage/educate	
E	Missouri Recycling Association - Manufacturing	\$28,430.00	\$28,428.00	\$7,313.00	\$0	\$35,743.00	Study of manufacturers in KC Region and their use/support of recycled content	
E	KC Rescue Mission	\$107,982.00	\$107,982.00	\$31,400.00	\$0	\$139,382.00	Support for new business food waste composting business	
E	RT Store	\$39,188.00	\$12,800.00	\$3,200.00	\$0	\$16,000.00	Scrap metal recycling advertising for reuse store	District did not want to fund salary for a full-time individual
E	The Surplus Exchange	\$26,800.00	\$26,800.00	\$6,700.00	\$0	\$33,500.00	Sprinter van for acquiring more electronics and customers	
E	City of Lawson	\$24,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$6,327.00	\$0	\$26,327.00	Recycling trailer for community recycling program	District chose not to fund a storage container for a trailer
E	M.L. Bass	\$36,500.00	\$36,500.00	\$9,175.00	\$0	\$45,675.00	Production of videos featuring four previous grantees and their projects	
E	Missouri Recycling Association – Education	\$26,114.00	\$26,114.00	\$6,839.00	\$0	\$32,953.00	Support for state-wide recycling conference	
E	R. Alexander Associates	\$49,000.00	\$49,000.00	\$12,250.00	\$0	\$61,250.00	Compost market research project	
E	Sleepyhead Beds	\$62,224.00	\$30,000.00	\$7,500.00	\$0	\$37,500.00	Digital advertising for reusable mattresses	District elected to fund components of a

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
								marketing campaign
F <sup>2</sup>	Region F Implementation (2018)	\$37,000.00	\$37,000.00	\$0	\$0	\$37,000.00	District plan implementation projects.	
F	Region F HHW (2018)	\$77,000.00	\$77,000.00	\$0	\$0	\$77,000.00	District HHW six containers and E-waste collections.	
F	City of Sedalia (2018)	\$42,500.00	\$42,500.00	\$7,500.00	\$0	\$50,000.00	Recycling carts and education campaign	15% match required
F	Ozark Recycling (2018)	\$14,358.24	\$14,358.24	\$2,533.81	\$0	\$16,892.05	Band-saw	15% match required
F	La Monte playground (2018)	\$37,339.64	\$37,339.64	\$6,589.35	\$0	\$43,928.99	Recycled play station	15% match required
F	Slater School District playground (2018)	\$24,900.00	\$24,900.00	\$4,394.10	\$0	\$29,294.12	Recycled play station	15% match required
F	City of Leeton playground (2018)	\$31,200.50	\$31,200.50	\$5,505.97	\$0	\$36,706.47	Recycled play station	15% match required
F	MORA (2018)	\$9,095.68	\$9,095.68	\$1,605.12	\$0	\$10,700.80	Recycling education	15% match required
F	City of Stover (2018)	\$6,205.77	\$6,205.77	\$1,095.14	\$0	\$7,300.91	Picnic tables	15% match required
G	Bevier High School	\$96700.00	\$96,700.00	\$10,744.44		\$107,444.44	Funds for the construction of a "green" resource building made from recycled materials.	
G	City of Moberly	\$57,360.00	\$57,360.00	\$14,340.00		\$71,700.00	Funds to implement a glass recycling program	
G	City of Palmyra	\$20,741.40	\$20,741.40	\$2,304.60		\$23,046.00	Funds to purchase a new forklift for Palmyra Recycle Committee's	

<sup>2</sup> At the time this report was completed, Region F had not submitted grant information for 2019. The grants listed here were reported for 2018.

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
		recycling collections						
G	City of La Plata	\$13,500.00	\$13,500.00	\$1,500.00		\$15,000.00	Funds to purchase recycled playground equipment, recycled fall surface and signage for City's Reservoir	
G	Marion County R-II School District	\$30,769.77	\$30,769.77	\$3,418.86		\$34,188.63	Funds to purchase new lockers and acoustic sound panels made from recycled material	
G	Pike County Sheltered Workshop	\$26,500.00	\$26,500.00	\$5,150.00		\$31,650.00	Funds to purchase a new Ford F150 truck to pull recycling trailers for curbside recycling	
G	Granuband Macon, LLC	\$25,500.00	\$25,500.00	\$2,833.33		\$28,333.33	Funds to purchase a new forklift to increase productivity of processing recycled tires	
G	Pike County Senate Bill 40 Board	\$45,000.00	\$45,000.00	\$5,000.00		\$50,000.00	Funds for the construction of a 36' x 60' building for storage of recycled materials collected	
H	Boonslick Industries	\$7,888.00	\$7,888.00	\$4,724.88		\$12,612.88	Boonslick will purchase eight larger volume rear load dumpsters. They are seeing significant increases in their commercial and municipal customers throughout their seven county operating region and many of these customers are requesting larger volume vessels for OCC.	
H	IMS, LLC	\$3,232.50	\$3,232.50	\$1,077.50		\$4,310.00	IMS will purchase a pallet jack in order to resolve a bottleneck in the amount of paper they are able to divert. This machine would increase the speed of production and reduce the amount of labor required to stage and process each pallet of paper.	

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
H	Curators of MU/MS&T	\$9,762.00	\$9,762.00	\$3,267.00		\$13,029.00	Missouri S&T will research into using Waste Latex Paint as a concrete admixture. Latex-modified concrete is already a widely used material known for its resistance to freeze/thaw cycles. Grant funds will support a technician and PI time. As well as needed funds for travel to present results to MoDNR and MoDOT.	
H	IMS, LLC	\$4,863.75	\$4,863.75	\$1,621.25		\$6,485.00	IMS will purchase a forklift scale to reduce redundancies and allow for greater efficiency in the process of paper recycling.	
H	River Relief, Inc.	\$8,743.19	\$8,743.19	\$11,442.70		\$20,185.89	Missouri River Relief is organizing a clean-up event for the 10 miles of the Missouri River and a portion of Cedar Creek from Capitol View Access. Grant funds will go to event coordination and boar usage and crew, new life jackets, paddles and a replacement door for the box truck. Volunteers will remove trash, plastic, aluminum, glass, tires, appliances, etc. from the river and dispose/recycle collected items responsibly.	
H	City of Columbia Parks and Rec – ARC	\$2,179.00	\$2,179.00	\$728.00		\$2,907.00	The City of Columbia's Activity and Recreation Center (Arc) is requesting funds to purchase recycling bins for their 70,000 sq ft facility. As it stands, they only have one recycling bin near the main desk and 2 bins in their office spaces only for paper. There is a lot	

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
H	Curators of MU	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$4,060.00		\$14,060.00	of wasted recyclable material being thrown away by their 900 patrons every day. There have been many comments from the public as well as City Staff about the lack of stations. Cardboard is currently being picked up by City routes.	
H	Show Me Central Habitat for Humanity	\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$34,736.00		\$134,736.00	Show Me Central Habitat for Humanity is requesting grant funds to outfit their new location on Business Loop 70 in Columbia. Their existing property is significantly overloaded with inventory and this new location will allow them to expand their operation to not only compensate for the existing materials, but also allow them to take on additional material that would normally be turned away. This project will include a new overhead loading door that is non-existent and essential to their operation. As well as new signage, racking and shelving, electric pallet jack, security cameras and a general remodel to make full use of the	

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
space in the larger facility.								
H	Handi-Shop, Inc.	\$8,183.83	\$8,183.83	\$2,727.94		\$10,911.77	Handi-Shop, Inc. is requesting funds to replace the aging box/bed of one of the 2 trucks in their recycling program. The box is separating from the bed and this causes unstable and unsafe operation. The truck is otherwise in well-maintained mechanical condition.	
H	Columbia Public Schools	\$96,137.20	\$96,137.20	\$32,045.73		\$128,182.93	Columbia Public Schools is requesting grant funds to launch a phased and multi-faceted recycling and composting program in all the school cafeterias in Columbia. 22 elementary, 6 middle and 4 high schools will all participate. The program is split into 3 phases of school groups that will receive their new receptacle stations. These stations will be comprised of 3 components (Mixed Container Recycling, Compostable Waste and Regular Trash). These stations would replace existing trash bins in the cafeteria space. The bins will be accompanied by signage that will be identical in design across the schools. In accordance to MMSWMD/MDNR regulations, the trash component costs of the bins have been removed from the grant request entirely. In addition to the stations, the grant request includes a waste sorting game education	

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
H	Midwest Recycling Center	\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00	\$5,000.00		\$20,000.00	platform that will be incorporated into the classrooms to further education on these sorting practices.	MRC is requesting funds to purchase a mobile Hard Drive Shredder for their e-waste operations. This machine would be portable via their truck from grant H2018-011 and would enable them to offer secure data destruction at collection events as well as their daily operations at their facility. Their current operation utilizes chain of custody documentation while the hard drives are being transported to the Shredding facility in Imperial, MO. This processing time dissuades customers who are concerned about their data. This mobile shredder will allow for immediate, on-site destruction and would attract more use of the service.
I	Boonslick Regional Planning Commission	\$68,000.00	\$68,000.00	\$38,293.41 Program Income		\$106,293.41	In April 2010, the Region I SWMD established the East Central Missouri Recycling Center. This was a collaborative effort of the four counties in Region I to provide an opportunity to recycle for all residents of the district. Grant funds awarded to this project are used for continued operational expenses of the recycling center. The facility is open year round.	

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
J* <sup>3</sup>	Bates County Industries (2018)	\$9,776.00	\$9,776.00	\$0		\$9,776.00	Reusable recycling bins	
J	Conference scholarships (2018)	\$8,448.00	\$8,448.00	\$1,317.00		\$9,765.00	Education for MO's Sheltered Workshops	
J	Meredith Recycling (2018)	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00	\$27,600.00		\$67,600.00	Wire granulator	
J	City of Clinton (2018)	\$20,000.00	\$8,776.00	\$3,1224.00		\$40,000.00	Composting	This grantee was offered the remaining grant funds.
K	Region K Project Implementation	\$37,300.00	\$37,300.00	\$0	\$0	\$37,300.00	Project implementation activities including Earth Day Poster and Trash Art Contest and celebration and exhibit events around the region; illegal dump surveillance camera program; district website maintenance; general technical assistance to citizens, businesses, schools and local governments.	
K	Rolla/St. Robert/ MRPC HHW Satellite Collection Centers	\$24,025.57	\$9,000.00	\$0	\$0	\$9,000.00	HHW collection program hosted by Rolla and St. Robert open to all district residents. Grant covers contractor costs, administration of the program, advertising and safety supplies	Funding was reduced in order to fund additional projects. Partial funding for a project that supports HHW sites in the district.
K	MRPC Special Waste Collections	\$28,935.25	\$27,287.50	\$0	\$0	\$27,287.50	Residential special collection events in 4 – 6 locations around the region for e-waste, white goods and tires. Pays for coordination, advertising, contractor costs, supplies, etc.	Grant was reduced to provide more funding for other projects.

<sup>3</sup> At the time this report was completed, Region J had not yet held a grant round for 2019. The grants listed here were reported for 2018.

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
K	Community Outreach and Assistance Fund	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$0	\$0	\$20,000.00	Funding to provide for needs requested outside the annual grant cycle or addressing emergencies such as material management from flood clean ups. Smaller projects requiring minimal funding may also be considered.	Funding was reduced in order to fund additional projects.
K	MRPC Illegal Dump Cleanup Program	\$46,955.19	\$30,000.00	\$0	\$0	\$30,000.00	Supports collection and recycling of illegally dumped tires; illegal dump volunteer clean ups; a follow up survey of illegal dumpsites to determine overall progress; student transportation trips relating to solid waste management; and public information and education.	Staff continues to search and apply for other grants to support this project. District funding was reduced in order to fund additional projects.
K	MRPC Education, Public Awareness and Business Outreach	\$32,552.48	\$24,266.36	\$0	\$0	\$24,266.36	Funds education and awareness projects aligned with target material priorities such as food waste reduction and composting. Provides school-based environmental education presentations.	Funding was reduced in order to fund additional projects.
K	Dixon High School Key Club	\$6,603.00	\$6,603.00	\$0	\$0	\$6,603.00	Funding for the Dixon school district's student-led recycling program, The Choice is Yours- Waste it or Recycle It! Provides for student education and recycling of cans, cardboard and mixed papers from three schools and local businesses.	Fully funded, ranking score was above 95%
K	Kaleidoscope Discovery Center	\$12,300.00	\$5,580.00	\$0	\$0	\$5,580.00	Funding for the Center to become a model office and building space for waste reduction through a "Strive for 75" campaign. With a multi-year plan, this phase will	With 15 approved grant requests totaling \$373,454 and \$185,048 available for funding, partial funding was

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
K	Dixon Area Caring Center	\$34,794.40	\$18,915.00	\$0	\$0	\$18,915.00	develop a model at the Rolla facility with a goal of 75% waste diversion.	offered and accepted.
K	Carney Dirt: Utilizing Public Art to Divert C&D waste	\$13,890.16	\$9,000.00	\$0	\$13,247.86	22,247.86	Support for staffing, equipment, supplies and transport of materials through a community based recycling center. Operations include textile bailing from the adjacent resale shop and a 24/7 drop-off recycling center.	Partial funding was accepted to cover salaries, supplies and transportation.
K	Salem Memorial District Hospital	\$18,200.00	\$10,995.00	\$0	\$15,747.00	\$26,742.00	Funding for a demonstration project for C&D waste diversion by repurposing construction materials into an outdoor art installation at Onondaga Cave State Park.	Partial funding was offered to this new applicant, but a change in park management has delayed the final paperwork and the project is currently on hold.
K	City of Waynesville	\$11,841.71	\$7,106.27	\$0	\$4,735.44	\$11,841.71	A start-up recycling and waste reduction campaign for a hospital-wide recycling program.	Partial funding was offered and accepted by this applicant.
K	City of Rolla Recycling Center	\$7,095.00	\$7,095.00	\$0	\$0	\$7,095.00	Funding for decreasing contamination through educational materials and distributing additional recycling bins for city residents.	Partial funding was offered and accepted by this applicant.
K	Crawford SB40 Board	\$67,358.00	\$9,000.00	\$0	\$0	\$9,000.00	Funding for video production demonstrating closed-loop recycling from newspaper being recycled curbside to local egg carton manufacturing.	Fully funded, ranking score was above 95%.
K							Funding for a start-up recycling program through a sheltered workshop for the purchase of a used forklift.	Initially partial funding was accepted but later declined as the sheltered workshop

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
K	Friends of Onondaga	\$30,501.63	\$15,778.00	\$0	\$0	\$15,778.00	Funding for building workshops using diverted construction and demolition (C&D) materials with a tool lending library and development of a C&D resource materials database.	determined the current recycling market was not strong enough to support a new start-up program.
L	St. Charles County Government	\$220,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$14,155.90	\$0.00	\$114,155.90	Drop off centers in St. Charles County provide residents with an option for recycling e-scrap and for proper disposal of household hazardous waste.	Initially partial funding was accepted, but due to a change in organizational governance, the project was not able to move forward and the funding was declined.
L	St. Louis County - Department of Health	\$228,240.00	\$100,000.00	\$23,240.00	\$0.00	\$123,240.00	Reducing the amount of household hazardous waste by providing a safe disposal option. Residents of the City of St. Louis, St. Louis County, and Jefferson County participate at two collection facilities.	Equipment - lightening loader truck Subcontracting - transportation and disposal of HHW & e-scrap
L	City of Byrnes Mill	\$132,761.00	\$45,000.00	\$5,161.00	\$0.00	\$50,161.00	Increase Byrnes Mill Recycling Center hours of operation to 6 days a week (Mon-Sat) with staff inspecting for contamination prior to compacting.	Direct costs - direct mail printing and postage; Subcontractor - labor and disposal at HHW facilities; updates to website  Personnel - (4) employees Direct costs - video surveillance, electric, road maintenance Subcontracting - container hauling, 3 phase power service

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	St. Louis Earth Day	\$57,911.50	\$20,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$0.00	\$45,000.00	The Recycling Extravaganza program is planning three large public recycling events to recycle items not currently accepted through curbside recycling.	Personnel - (2) Project Manager and Events Manager Direct costs - rent, marketing, electronics recycling, paper shredding
L	Missouri Botanical Garden - EarthWays Center	\$73,872.60	\$60,000.00	\$12,345.00	\$0.00	\$72,345.00	Use existing educational programs and staff to promote regional recycling messaging to a variety of audiences. Additional support covers transportation, mileage and professional development.	Personnel - (4+) Education Coordinator, Sustainability Manager, Accountant, Sustainability Program Coord., EarthWays' Volunteers
L	Jefferson County Solid Waste Division	\$194,635.00	\$100,000.00	\$26,718.20	\$0.00	\$126,718.20	Opening a fenced recycling facility offering separate containers for plastic, paper, cardboard, glass, aluminum, scrap metal, electronics, and a compost pile. A dedicated employee will assist citizens in proper recycling.	Personnel - (3) - Recycling Coordinator; Equipment - fencing, garage and canopy; Direct costs - brochures, advertising, containers, barriers, signage; Subcontracting - events, shredding, battery recycling, hauling containers
L	Missouri River Relief	\$9,858.75	\$7,500.00	\$5,431.80	\$0.00	\$12,931.80	Large-scale river cleanup events engage volunteers from surrounding communities in removing trash and basic recyclables (aluminum, glass, plastic), along with tires, scrap metal, and appliances from designated rivers.	Personnel - (1+) event coordinator and volunteers Direct costs - boats, operators, photographer, and coordinator
L	St. Louis Earth Day	\$84,201.20	\$65,000.00	\$23,105.00	\$0.00	\$88,105.00	St. Louis Earth Day's Recycling On the Go provides composting and recycling services at festivals and	Personnel - (4) - Director, PM, Assistant PM, Site Supervisor

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
							events. The fee-based program offers full-service, staffed events or recycling equipment rental.	Direct costs - rent and storage space
L	City of Hazelwood	\$10,570.00	\$8,500.00	\$2,469.00	\$0.00	\$10,969.00	Hosting the municipality's recycling collection event on America Recycles Day 2019. Publicity and advertising will inform residents of the annual event.	Direct costs - advertising annual recycling event Subcontracting - collection vendors
L	Remains, Inc.	\$48,000.00	\$40,000.00	\$14,080.00	\$0.00	\$54,080.00	Divert non-wearable and unusable denim jeans and uniform attire into feedstock for processing through a textile tearing line. The buttons, zippers, snaps, etc., are removed before processing.	Personnel - (2) - Material Processors
L	Operation Brightside	\$213,836.59	\$100,000.00	\$12,000.00	\$0.00	\$112,000.00	The Recycle Responsibly campaign goal is to reduce the confusion and contamination of recycling by educating the public.	Direct costs - flyers, reusable bags; Subcontracting - Public Relations firm advertising, video development
L	City of O'Fallon	\$86,000.00	\$70,000.00	\$8,070.00	\$0.00	\$78,070.00	Changes in the recycling industry led the municipality to separate cardboard and paper from curbside recycling. Strategically located 30-yard containers will provide for recycle at the same level.	Equipment - 30-yard recycling containers; decals and graphics
L	Missouri Recycling Association (MORA)	\$38,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$4,268.55	\$0.00	\$29,268.55	Annual MORA conference focuses on developing new endeavors and expanding existing programs across the state. Conference in St. Louis.	Direct Costs - exhibit hall, room rentals, tour transportation, awards, audio visuals, speakers, and printing
L	Adonis Holdings LLC	\$49,500.00	\$35,000.00	\$7,000.00	\$0.00	\$42,000.00	Responsible data destruction for electronics by employing trained staff to address the increase in volume and insure proper	Personnel - (2) - Bench Technician, Forklift Operator

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
procedures.								
L	City of Breckenridge Hills	\$84,500.00	\$25,000.00	\$2,500.00	\$0.00	\$27,500.00	Launching a municipal single-stream recycling program for residents and businesses by acquiring recycling carts and conducting an educational campaign to promote proper participation.	Direct costs - recycling collection bins/lids Subcontracting - partner with Waste Connections for education component
L	Central Paper Stock Company, Inc.	\$43,900.00	\$35,000.00	\$14,900.00	\$0.00	\$49,900.00	Install a manufactured storage shelter to keep paper and outside conveyor belt dry to prevent contamination issues and increase recycling.	Equipment - shelter with installation
L	Waste Connections	\$43,191.48	\$30,000.00	\$8,400.00	\$0.00	\$38,400.00	Hire a Recycle Coordinator to oversee the new approach to ensure a cleaner residential single-stream processing system.	Personnel - (1) - Recycle Coordinator Direct costs - tablet, boots, glasses, vests, gloves
L	Always Green Recycling, Inc.	\$21,250.00	\$15,000.00	\$2,250.00	\$0.00	\$17,250.00	Acquiring 57 two-yard rear load containers will divert greater amounts of residential and commercial single stream recyclables. The containers will be serviced by rear load trucks already in place.	Equipment - 57 2-yard load containers
L	St. Louis Health Equipment Lending Program, Inc. (STL HELP)	\$45,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$13,515.00	\$0.00	\$38,515.00	The service of lending medical equipment at no cost to those in need is expanding into Jefferson County. The program collects equipment donations that are then serviced for reuse.	Personnel - (4) Executive Director and 3 managers Direct costs - Rent
L	L.E.D.R. LLC	\$193,500.00	\$85,000.00	\$29,900.00	\$0.00	\$114,900.00	Adding a second roll-off truck will increase the volume of materials being collected, enabling the plant to run full time. Based at the St.	Equipment - roll-off truck

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
		Charles location, the services are district-wide.						
L	City of Wentzville	\$81,158.40	\$55,000.00	\$6,996.00	\$0.00	\$61,996.00	Adding updated cardboard recycling containers at drop off locations around the city will accommodate the growing amount of cardboard being recycled and will further cut down on contamination.	Direct costs - 20-yard 22-foot main rails recycling can with cardboard slot
L	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council	\$31,049.14	\$15,000.00	\$1,933.38	\$0.00	\$16,933.38	OneSTL has a consortium of members engaged in a multifaceted effort to support greater sustainability in the St. Louis region. The contents of the website will be updated.	Personnel - (4) - Manager of Environmental and Community Planning, Manager of Sustainability Planning, Grant/Contract Compliance Administrator, Intern
L	Missouri Kids Unplugged	\$40,000.00	\$30,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$34,000.00	The Recycling Road Show partners with organizations to educate youth about recycling, composting, and reuse. Students learn how materials are recycled or reused by activities, such as disassembling an old computer.	Personnel - (2) - Presenters, Helper
L	Habitat for Humanity of St. Charles County Restore	\$39,960.00	\$25,000.00	\$3,400.00	\$0.00	\$28,400.00	Accepts, sorts, and refurbishes donated items and partners with local non-profit organizations for dissemination. Donation pick-ups are possible.	Direct costs - rent, fuel, utilities, utility shed assistance
L	Operation Brightside	\$112,430.19	\$50,000.00	\$7,740.00	\$0.00	\$57,740.00	Increase the participation and volume of recycling in the City of St. Louis by continuing the distribution of recycle bins to schools and households.	Direct costs - bins, printing, mailing, translation, educational, roll carts, MORA fees, stickers, office supplies

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	Missouri Recycling Association (MORA)	\$38,880.00	\$25,000.00	\$2,800.00	\$0.00	\$27,800.00	Statewide effort to identify Missouri manufacturers that utilize recovered materials or have the potential to convert a recyclable material into feed stock.	Personnel - (3) - Executive Director, Administrative Assistant, Grant Writer
L	Perennial	\$41,634.00	\$20,000.00	\$3,212.00	\$0.00	\$23,212.00	Workshops and off-site services foster a culture of reuse and waste reduction districtwide with a focus on women in transition.	Personnel - (4) - Executive Director/Project Manager, Programs manger, Outreach Specialist, and Woodshop Specialist
L	St. Louis Earth Day	\$88,115.84	\$50,000.00	\$16,980.00	\$0.00	\$66,980.00	Restaurants in the St. Louis area participate in a program designed to reduce the amount of waste, compost, and increase recycling.	Personnel - (3) - Project Manager, GDA Project Manager, GDA Assistant Project Manager Direct costs - rent, web hosting/maintenance, advertising
L	City of Valley Park	\$10,000.00	\$6,409.39	\$862.61	\$0.00	\$7,272.00	Separating paper from single-stream recycling will result in cleaner processing. Paper will be collected at drop-off locations with education.	Direct costs - containers and literature
L	Spectrum Ecycle Solutions, Inc.	\$31,464.00	\$15,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$0.00	\$17,000.00	Dismantling of TVs and CRT's requires costly handling and transportation to a hazardous waste processor. Offsetting the recycling cost lowers program fees.	Direct costs - CRT recycling, transportation to CRT processor
L	U.S. Green Building Council - Missouri Gateway Chapter	\$27,741.81	\$20,000.00	\$3,142.00	\$0.00	\$23,142.00	Green Schools Quest will continue education programs that emphasize the importance of recycling, waste reduction and material reuse with K-12 schools.	Personnel - (2) Executive Director and Green Schools Manger Direct costs - supplies

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	MRC1 LLC (DBA MRC Recycling)	\$63,313.00	\$45,000.00	\$6,201.00	\$0.00	\$51,201.00	A mobile hard-drive/security data shredder will ensure proper destruction of personal information on electronic devices.	Personnel - (1) Driver Equipment - shredder and generator Subcontracting - modify trailer Direct costs - CRT/TV recycling, shrink wrap & Gaylord boxes
L	Flooring Systems Inc.	\$37,800.00	\$15,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$0.00	\$18,000.00	The carpet reclamation program recycles carpet from commercial job sites and through collection events. The material is sorted and processed for recycling.	Personnel - (1) Recycling Tech Equipment - containers, compactor, 2 storage trailers, 4 dump carts
L	Didion Orf Recycling	\$47,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$2,650.00	\$0.00	\$27,650.00	Increase electronic volumes using additional fork lift to load and unload trailers and process electronics materials more efficiently.	Equipment - two additional forklifts
L	City of Webster Groves	\$61,828.38	\$45,000.00	\$4,806.20	\$0.00	\$49,806.20	Establishing two glass drop-off sites on city property to decrease contamination of curbside single-stream.	Direct costs - education material, postage, construction, signage; Subcontracting - fence installation, Waste Mgmt for glass containers, recovery facility, furnish containers, hauling
L	EPC, Inc.	\$45,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$65,000.00	\$0.00	\$90,000.00	Electronics recycler to replace aging 26' box truck used for equipment pickups and to transfer e-scrap for processing.	Equipment - replace 26' box truck
L	INC Environmental Recycling	\$41,000.00	\$30,000.00	\$4,500.00	\$0.00	\$34,500.00	Material handling will be increased to meet the multi-county need for residential single-stream recycling processors by accepting more loads and ensuring a maximum	Equipment - skid steer loader with grapple bucket

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
							number of recyclables are captured.	
L	Midwest Material Recovery	\$29,300.00	\$20,000.00	\$4,605.30	\$0.00	\$24,605.30	Electronics recycling requires periodic maintenance and repair items to insure the conveyer belt remains running at full capacity.	Direct costs - replacement parts for conveyor
L	Pedro's Planet, Inc.	\$49,500.00	\$20,000.00	\$37,376.00	\$0.00	\$57,376.00	Increased collection of recyclables (paper, cardboard, plastic, cans) from commercial entities, including paper, toner and ink cartridges.	Equipment - 16-foot diesel cargo truck with lift gate
L	St. Louis Recycling	\$49,999.00	\$20,000.00	\$35,749.00	\$0.00	\$55,749.00	Increase the collection of commercial single-stream recyclables by adding a rear-loader compactor truck.	Equipment - real-load compactor truck
L	Operation Food Search	\$14,811.20	\$7,000.00	\$1,340.00	\$0.00	\$8,340.00	Donations collected from program partners (grocery stores) are measured and documented using a mobile tablet receipt program.	Personnel - (3) - Agency Relations Director, Donations Account Manager & Finance/Administration Manager Direct costs - electronic tablets, protective cases
L	Jack Kaufmann	\$25,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$0.00	\$6,000.00	Multi-media performances engage kids (K-8) though music focused on education about local recycling to encourage participation.	Personnel - (1) Jack Kaufmann
L	Refab	\$117,688.34	\$60,000.00	\$14,599.00	\$0.00	\$74,599.00	A value-added workshop that transforms lumber from deconstructed buildings into countertops, tabletops, shelving, paneling, mantles, etc.	Personnel (3) - Lab Manager, Community Workshop Coordinator, Exec Director, Equipment - straight line rip saw, brush sander, up cut saw; Direct costs

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	Jeffco Subcontracting Inc. (JSI)	\$32,630.00	\$23,000.00	\$4,760.00	\$0.00	\$27,760.00	Cardboard and shrink wrap collection/pick-up service in Jefferson County employs more than 100 workers with disabilities. Employees unload the trucks and process materials into the baler for recycling.	Personnel - truck driver and cardboard workers Direct costs - mileage
L	Proud Veteran Resources Recycling, LLC	\$49,999.00	\$25,000.00	\$11,750.00	\$0.00	\$36,750.00	Providing a convenient, recycling drop off facility in DeSoto servicing the surrounding areas in Jefferson County. Traditional recyclables are separated when collected. Appliances are also accepted.	Personnel - (2) Director and Administrative Assistant
L	City of Kirkwood	\$124,770.00	\$25,000.00	\$4,550.00	\$0.00	\$29,550.00	The municipal program is transitioning to an automated collection system requiring carts and lids.	Direct costs - 96-gallon recycling carts, in-molded lid label Subcontracting - survey/data entry, assemble/deliver carts, re-cover 64-gallon carts for reuse
L	Home Sweet Home	\$25,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$0.00	\$30,000.00	Furniture bank assists families in need by providing donated furniture, linens, home decorations, to participants at no cost.	Personnel - (1) - Warehouse Coordinator Direct costs - warehouse lease
L	Bicycle Works of St. Louis (DBA Bworks)	\$30,500.00	\$15,000.00	\$7,900.00	\$0.00	\$22,900.00	Youth bikes, collected through donations in the St. Louis Metro area, are refurbished for the Build A Bike reuse programs for youth 7-17.	Personnel - (1) - Recycling Manager/Refurbishment
L	City of St. Louis Refuse Division	\$172,262.37	\$40,000.00	\$9,300.00	\$0.00	\$49,300.00	Retrofitting the metal lids on alley dumpsters used for residential recycling will result in better collection and participation. New, lighter and better fitting lids will	Direct costs - plastic lids with rods, decals/stickers

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
reduce moisture contamination.								
L	St. Louis Teachers' Recycle Center	\$200,050.00	\$10,000.00	\$1,810.00	\$0.00	\$11,810.00	Three resource centers and a mobile vehicle cultivate eco-friendly communities through education and sustainable practices.	Personnel - Executive Director, 3 center directors, Dev Director, Grant Administrator, Warehouse Manager, etc.; Direct costs - rent, insurance, phone, workshops & field trips
L	City of Wildwood	\$232,500.00	\$25,000.00	\$2,494.60	\$0.00	\$27,494.60	Converting to dual stream collection at the curb will reduce contamination. Materials will go to local markets for processing.	Equipment - fiber recycle bins Subcontracting - cart set-up and delivery w/Meridian
L	Leftovers, Etc. (Resource Recovery Project, Inc.)	\$60,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$2,500.00	\$0.00	\$22,500.00	The resource center provides educators access to alternative and affordable supplies. Stock is generated from manufacturers and businesses that donate overstock or unused materials.	Direct costs - rent, utilities Subcontracting - Warehouse Assistant, 2 Workshop Facilitators
L	City of University City	\$48,000.00	\$24,000.00	\$2,772.40	\$0.00	\$26,772.40	A feasibility study and cost analysis of reopening the municipal MRF will assess the market dynamics to determine the needs, costs, and achievable revenue.	Subcontracting - engineering consultant
L	Sustainable Backyard Network	\$28,910.00	\$4,000.00	\$690.00	\$0.00	\$4,690.00	A free event to educate households about recycling, composting organics, solar power, edible landscaping, rain gardens, and alternatives to household hazardous waste.	Personnel - (1) Tour Manager; Direct costs - printing, t-shirts, insurance, garden marker, advertising, orientation, buttons Subcontracting - Graphic Designer

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	Arm Strong Environmental, L.L.C.	\$35,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$18,205.00	\$0.00	\$38,205.00	Multifamily recycling program to acquire a vehicle to support the addition of new apartment units throughout the district.	Equipment - 4-wheel drive truck
L	Product Stewardship Institute	\$69,140.84	\$30,000.00	\$5,737.00	\$0.00	\$35,737.00	A Missouri Product Stewardship Council identified paint as a priority waste. A Paint Recycling planning meeting and facility tour are intended to develop paint stewardship framework for Missouri.	Personnel - (6) - Executive Director, Sr. Associate KAC, Sr. Associate VP, Comm Assoc, Finance Director, Policy Intern Direct costs
M	Plan Implementation	\$ 85,000.00	\$ 85,000.00			\$ 85,000.00	Region M plan implementation: wages and fringe for planner and assistant to organize community outreach and education, speaking in classrooms, informational booths at environmental events; funds for 8 subgrants to schools/non-profit organizations at \$3,000 max each*; Bronze Level (\$1,000) sponsorship of MORA's annual conference; staff expenses for MORA conference attendance; community outreach supplies (printed give-aways and prizes for MSSU's and Crowder College's Annual Earth Day Events; partnerships with community collection events (providing E-waste contractor and onsite document destruction); and relocation of equipment in district.	<u>Education Projects</u> - Martin Luther School in Joplin, Webster Primary in Webb City, Spiva Center for the Arts in Joplin, Bronaugh School District, Crowder College in Neosho, Joplin Public Library, McAuley High School in Joplin, MSSU in Joplin. <u>Community Collection Events</u> - Sheldon, Golden City, Anderson, Carterville, Nevada, Carl Junction, Joplin, Vernon County, Lamar, Webb City, Duenweg.
M	City of Joplin	\$ 37,566.00	\$ 37,566.00			\$ 37,566.00	Half wages and fringe to cover full time employee at recycling center, HHW contractor and E-waste contractor.	

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
M	Vernon County	\$ 36,814.02	\$ 36,814.02			\$ 36,814.02	Wages and fringe to cover two part time employees at the recycling center.	
M	City of Neosho	\$ 49,733.00	\$ 49,733.00			\$ 49,733.00	Wages and fringe to cover one full time employee at the recycle center, baling wire and E-waste contractor.	
M	Lamar Enterprises	\$ 30,123.36	\$ 30,123.36			\$ 30,123.36	Partial wages for supervisor who manages recycle program at sheltered workshop, collection bins, tires and battery for forklift.	
M	City of Sheldon	\$ 4,732.00	\$ 4,732.00			\$ 4,732.00	Wages and fringe for part time employee who collects recycle in Sheldon and delivers to recycle center in Nevada, collection bins, fuel and maintenance on vehicle.	
M	City of Carthage	\$ 14,001.54	\$ 14,001.54			\$ 14,001.54	Wages and fringe for part time employee at recycling center.	
M	City of Seneca	\$ 7,020.00	\$ 7,020.00			\$ 7,020.00	Wages for part time employee at recycling center.	
M	Newton County Litter	\$ 74,311.33	\$ 65,311.33			\$ 65,311.33	Wages and fringe for part time employee who manages the litter control and recycle program, 10-bin trailer for collection, used truck, fuel and maintenance.	Partial funding due to tall requested amount, Newton County representative agreed to accept partial funding.
M	Sheldon School District	\$ 5,730.00	\$ 5,730.00			\$ 5,730.00	Wages for part time employees (staffed by students) for collection of recycle materials, mileage and supplies.	

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
M	McDonald County Litter	\$ 36,972.20	\$ 9,701.20			\$ 9,701.20	Wages for part time employees to haul recycle materials from collection site in Pineville to Neosho, and supplies.	Region M board did not approve funding for tire cutting equipment due to the county having no end-user in place.
M	City of Noel	\$ 50,100.00	\$ 45,100.00			\$ 45,100.00	Wages for part time employees at recycle center, utilities, repairs and maintenance.	The Noel recycling center closed in November 2018. Equipment that Region M still had an interest in was transferred to other locations in the district.
M	Service Recycling	\$ 24,704.00	\$ 24,704.00			\$ 24,704.00	Four 40-yard receiver boxes for collection and compaction of cardboard at local manufacturing facilities.	
M	All Points Recycling	\$ 38,850.00	\$ 38,850.00			\$ 38,850.00	Grinder for rigid plastic materials, freight and installation.	
M	City of Granby	\$ 79,632.96	\$ 51,632.96			\$ 51,632.96	Partial wages and fringe for full time employee at recycle center, skidsteer loader and mileage for collection.	Partial funding due to tall requested amount, Granby representative agreed to accept partial funding.
M	MACO Creations	\$ 31,020.00	\$ 31,020.00			\$ 31,020.00	Trailer for glass collection, glass pulverizer, (8) concrete mixers, and (8) heat guns for the manufacturing of countertops with reclaimed glass content.	
M	Triple R Recycling	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00			\$ 20,000.00	Three semitrailers for collection and storage of recycle materials at local manufacturing facilities, and a chipper for wood bi-product from rebuilt pallet operation.	

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
M	Jasper County Litter Control	\$ 24,750.69	\$ 24,750.69			\$ 24,750.69	Wages and fringe for part time employee who manages the litter control and recycle program, supplies, and mileage for collection.	
M	Joplin Workshops	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00		\$ 5,000.00	Funding for half the purchase price of a commercial grade paper shredder, used in high-volume document destruction at the sheltered workshop.	
M	Computer Recycling Center	\$ 49,500.00	\$ 49,500.00			\$ 49,500.00	Box truck for the collection and freight of electronic waste.	
M	Joplin Area Habitat ReStore	\$ 26,520.00	\$ 26,520.00			\$ 26,520.00	Partial wages for driver who collects donated items that were left over from construction projects for reuse and resale.	
M	3M Corporation	\$ 69,500.00	\$ 20,000.00			\$ 20,000.00	Partial funding for horizontal baler to be used for cardboard generated at the Nevada manufacturing facility.	Partial funding due to first time application to the district and low score. Will more than likely de-obligate in early FY2020 due to no activity, and proper timeframe for reporting diversion numbers after equipment is installed (no scheduled date as of yet).
M	City of Neosho Equip from Noel	\$ -	\$ -				10-bin trailer to be used for collection of recycle materials.	Reassigned equipment previously used in Noel recycle center operations.
M	Vernon County Equip from Noel	\$ -	\$ -				Vertical baler for processing cardboard and paper, and floor scale for weighing materials	Reassigned equipment previously used in Noel recycle center

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
							generated at recycle center.	operations.
M	City of Joplin Equip from Noel	\$ -	\$ -				Portable docking ramp for loading recycle materials on semitrailers for freight to end user/downstream vendor.	Reassigned equipment previously used in Noel recycle center operations.
M	Joplin Workshops Equip from Noel	\$ -	\$ -				Vertical baler for processing cardboard and paper.	Reassigned equipment previously used in Noel recycle center operations.
N	All Points Recycling, LLC	\$19,500.00	\$19,500.00			\$19,500.00	This grant funded the purchase of a used Bobcat/Skidsteer to be used to move recyclables, load and unload trucks, and clean debris away from the drainage areas of their loading/unloading docks. All Points is a minority owned and operated recycling and processing business serving the Barry county area in a 250 mile radius of All Points.	
N	Hansen's Tree Service	\$7,831.33	\$7,831.33			\$7,831.33	This grant funded the purchase of a Clearspan building to store finished compost. The 30x15x60 Econoline Clearspan building, rafter kit, cross connector for pipe, wedge anchor and freight will store 1,000 yards or 300 tons of finished compost at Hansen's Tree Service Stone County/Reeds Spring location. This will allow their finished compost to stay dry and contaminate free and allow them to increase their diversion of organic waste by an additional 5-	

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
							10%.	
N	District N Recycling Trailer	\$7,976.00	\$7,976.00			\$7,976.00	This grant will fund the purchase of a recycling trailer. The trailer will be housed in a more rural area within the district to be used for recycling efforts reducing materials going to landfills.	
N	District N Electronic Recycling (one event per county)	\$18,450.00	\$18,450.00			\$18,450.00	This grant funds one day electronic recycling events for each county within the district. This grant will fund contractor fees, supplies for event, media ads, advertisement and etc.	
N	Tantone Industries, Inc. – Sheltered Workshop	\$30,443.00	\$25,843.00			\$30,443.00	This grant will fund the purchase of a large cargo van to expand their weekly pickup routes of cardboard and recyclables. Tantone is a non-profit business employing developmentally disabled adults and providing pickup for businesses in the area.	The amount of funding shortage for this grant was the amount of the vehicle wrap. The Board voted not to fund this part of the grant due to the fact they felt it would not help to increase tonnage diversion. Tantone would have to internally fund this amount.
N	Village of Indian Point	\$550.00	\$550.00			\$550.00	This project funded the purchase and installation of an a gutter and downspout to keep water off the recycling trailer. This will help during inclement weather keeping the recycling area safer for citizens dropping of recycling and to keep the recyclables dry. Also, this helps in volunteer safety.	

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
N	Stone County	\$885.00	\$885.00			\$885.00	This funded registration and lodging fees and membership dues for one District N board member from Stone County to attend the MORA conference. This will allow the board member to attend educational sessions to learn more about recycling and to network with fellow peers in the recycling business.	
O	Big Brothers Big Sisters of the Ozarks	\$45,950.40	\$45,950.40	n/a	n/a	\$45,950.40	This grant funded a box truck and several bins for textile collection in support of a local non-profit's recycling program.	
O	Big Dog Recycling	\$45,143.00	\$41,008.43	n/a	n/a	\$41,008.43	This grant funded a new truck and some containers to support recycling efforts in Polk County.	
O	Computer Recycling Center	\$45,500.00	\$41,365.43	\$0	\$0	\$41,365.43	This grant helped fund the purchase of a baler that bales plastic in denser bales, thus improving the company's ability to meet buyers' specifications and sell recycled plastic.	
O	Downtown Springfield Association	\$45,938.00	\$41,803.44	\$0	\$0	\$41,803.44	This grant supports an ongoing glass recycling program that services over 30 downtown Springfield bars and restaurants.	
O	Greene County Youth Academy - Juvenile Office	\$1,773.65	\$1,773.65	\$0	\$0	\$1,773.65	This is a one-time grant to assist a grant funded program dispose of donated computer equipment that is obsolete.	
O	Habitat for Humanity	\$48,000.00	\$43,865.44	\$0	\$0	\$43,865.44	This grant funded a new box truck for the purpose of picking up donated household items for the ReStore program.	

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
O	Pleasant Hope School District	\$5,792.53	\$5,792.53	\$0	\$0	\$5,792.53	This grant providing funding for continued support of the recycling program at Pleasant Hope High School.	
O	Springfield Victory Mission	\$6,042.47	\$6,042.47	\$0	\$0	\$6,042.47	This grant funded materials for a food preservation program at a local organization that serves the homeless and other underprivileged individuals. Preservation reduces food waste and extends the shelf life of fresh food that distributed in their food pantry or used for nightly meals for the homeless.	
O	Springfield Victory Mission	\$28,975.00	\$28,975.00	n/a	n/a	\$28,975.00	This grant funded a box truck for the purpose of picking up donated items for Victory Mission.	
O	TrailSpring, Inc.	\$48,000.00	\$24,000.00	n/a	n/a	\$24,000.00	This grant funded a truck, trailer, and bins to start a recycling program at a dirt-bike trail park.	
O	Watershed Committee of the Ozarks	\$21,156.00	\$21,156.00	n/a	n/a	\$21,156.00	This grant funded recycling bins, composting equipment, and a utility vehicle for a recycling program at a watershed center. The project also includes education for kids regarding recycling and composting.	
P	District Plan Implementation	\$ 31,454.03	\$ 31,454.03	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 31,454.03	Technical assistance and plan implementation.	
P	Region P Electronic Collections	\$ 11,500.00	\$ 11,500.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,500.00	Funding for Electronic Wastes collections in the district.	
P	District P – Illegal Dump Cleanup	\$ 11,300.00	\$ 11,300.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,300.00	Collections.	
P	City of West Plains	\$ 14,188.00	\$ 14,188.00	\$ 14,188.00	\$ -	\$ 28,376.00	Funding for a skid loader	

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
P	Oregon County Recycling Association	\$ 17,160.00	\$ 17,160.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -	\$ 22,160.00	Funding for wages and equipment repairs & parts	
P	Shannon County Recycling Program	\$ 11,400.00	\$ 11,400.00	\$ 2,400.00	\$ -	\$ 13,800.00	Funding for wages, maintenance and fuel.	
P	Mountain View Recycling Center	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25,000.00	Funding for a skid loader	
P	Ozark County Recycling Center	\$ 15,600.00	\$ 15,600.00	\$ 16,064.00	\$ -	\$ 31,664.00	wages o maintain the employment of one person at the center.	
P	City of Cabool	\$ 1,853.00	\$ 1,853.00	\$ 716.00	\$ -	\$ 2,569.00	Purchase of a 16-foot tandem axle utility trailer with an 82" wide deck and 30 fourteen gallon plastic recycling bins	
P	Kevin Garrett Recycling Program - Texas County	\$ 19,312.00	\$ 19,312.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Wages, fuel for route and rent on product storage warehouse	
Q	Ozark Foothills Solid Waste Management District	\$90,081.00	\$90,081.00	\$0	\$0	\$90,081.00	Continue operation of recycling center and goals for waste diversion.	District Q uses all district grant funds to operate a regional recycling facility.
R <sup>4</sup>	Bollinger County Recycling Inc. (2018)	\$9,128.00	\$9,128.00	\$0	\$0	\$9,128.00	Equipment purchase and operating expenses.	
R	City of Fredericktown (2018)	\$8,105.00	\$8,105.00	\$0	\$0	\$8,105.00	Purchase of collection bags and recycling cans.	
R	Holcim USA/Ste. Genevieve County (2018)	\$35,742.00	\$35,742.00	\$0	\$0	\$35,742.00	HHW collection event.	
R	In-the-Green Productions (2018)	\$9,000.00	\$9,000.00	\$0	\$0	\$9,000.00	Educational programs in the schools.	

<sup>4</sup> At the time this report was completed, Region R had not yet held a grant round for 2019. The grants listed here were reported for 2018.

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
R	Life of Jesus Organization (2018)	\$16,000.00	\$16,000.00	\$0	\$0	\$16,000.00	Purchase of a truck and trailer.	
R	Missouri Kids Unplugged (2018)	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$0	\$0	\$10,000.00	Educational program.	
R	MRC (2018)	\$23,230.00	\$23,230.00	\$0	\$0	\$23,230.00	Purchase of equipment and subsidize CRT collection fees.	
R	Ste. Genevieve Recycling Center (2018)	\$5,627.00	\$5,627.00	\$0	\$0	\$5,627.00	Purchase and install dock sealing system.	
S	Region S Plan Implementation	\$33,675.33	\$33,675.33	\$0	\$0	\$33,675.33	Funds the goals of the solid waste management plan including E-Waste collection, recycling education in the local school systems and organizations and equipment repair and maintenance.	The grant funds personnel, hauling, redemption fees, equipment upkeep and educational supplies and resources.
S	PPI Sheltered Workshop	\$44,577.60	\$44,577.60	\$0	\$0	\$44,577.60	PPI collects trash, sorts recyclables and hauls recyclables to the Hayti sheltered workshop in Pemiscot County	The grant funds personnel. PPI collects Hallmark Cards to be separated and recycled.
S	Scott County Recycling	\$10,248.00	\$10,248.00	\$0	\$0	\$10,248.00	SCR collects trash, sorts recyclables and hauls recyclables to the Hayti sheltered workshop in Pemiscot County.	The grant funds personnel. SCR collects items from county roadsides.
S	City of Dexter	\$2,938.00	\$2,938.00	\$0	\$0	\$2,938.00	Dexter purchased a glass crusher and product is used to fill pot holes.	The grant funds purchasing a glass crusher.
S	Portageville Recycling	\$6,610.00	\$6,610.00	\$0	\$0	\$6,610.00	PR uses a recycling trailer to collect, sort and haul recyclables to the PPI sheltered workshop in Hayti, MO in Pemiscot County.	The grant funds personnel.
S	Cotton Boll Sheltered Workshop	\$45,200.00	\$45,200.00	\$25,000.00	\$0	\$70,200.00	CBSW collects, sorts and markets recyclables in Kennett from all across Dunklin County and surrounding towns. They receive	The grant funds personnel. CBSW collects some specialty items like cotton

## Funded Grant Projects

District	Organization	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Match Funding	Other Funds	Total Project Cost	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
S	Stoddard County Sheltered Workshop	\$45,000.00	\$45,000.00	\$0	\$0	\$45,000.00	recycling trailers from surrounding towns. They have security bins and run two box trucks throughout the county.	modular tarps, drip tape, super sacks (seed bags), and polyethylene film (John Deere cotton bale plastic).
T <sup>5</sup>	Gateway Industries (2018)	\$9,557.00	\$9,557.00	\$41,080.00	\$0	\$50,637.00	Shredder.	The grant funds personnel. SCSW owns 18 recycling collection trailers and communities own 8-10 recycling collection trailers which are pulled to SCSW.
T	Lake Area Industries (2018)	\$5,466.16	\$5,466.16	\$607.36	\$0	\$6,073.52	Foam/Cardboard collection trailers.	
T	City of Osage Beach (2018)	\$4,100.00	\$3,800.00	\$985.40	\$300.00	\$5,085.40	White goods collection and recycling.	\$300 in program income.
T	Laclede Industries (2018)	\$14,701.56	\$14,701.56	\$4,900.51	\$0	\$19,602.07	Macro bins.	
T	City of Osage Beach (2018)	\$19,845.00	\$19,845.00	\$2,205.00	\$0	\$22,050.00	Waste oil furnace.	
T	Rock Island Iron and Metal (2018)	\$12,600.00	\$3,329.73	\$1,400.00	\$9,270.27	\$14,000.00	28" hydraulic magnet	Carryover unobligated.

<sup>5</sup> At the time this report was completed, Region T had not submitted grant information for 2019. The grants listed here were reported for 2018.

## ATTACHMENT B

### FY2017 DISTRICT UNFUNDED PROJECTS

District	Organization	Preliminary Application-Did Not Submit Final Application (X)	Amount Requested	Low Score or Incomplete	Insufficient Grant Funds	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
A	Worth County		\$15,600.00	No	No	Request for funds to purchase a wood mulcher attachment.	Applicant did not demonstrate an increase in waste diversion or the plan to execute other District goals.
B	No unfunded grants						
C	Scotland County R-1 School	X	\$45,000	Incomplete	X	Recycled content playground equipment/playground base.	Applicant did not complete grant with correct information.
D	Missouri University of Science and Technology		\$25,996.00	Low Score		Implement rubberized chip seal road within the District.	There was not sufficient information on where the road would be located, the cost and who would pay for the road.
E	The Tellus Group		\$47,680.00	Low Score		Expansion of market for re-purposed materials	
E	Sleepyhead Beds (w/AOL)		\$93,867.00			Marketing campaign for mattress reuse and recycling	Insufficient information
E	The Surplus Exchange		\$35,200			Marketing campaign for electronics recycling	Insufficient information
E	Robert Williams		\$49,000.00			Industrial recycling services	Insufficient information
E	Scripted Health Systems		\$99,557.00	Incomplete		Truck and salary for durable medical equipment	
E	The Shift Bicycle Shop		\$20,029.00	Low Score		Tools and rent for reuse bike shop start-up	
E	NE KC Chamber of Commerce		\$36,026.00	Low Score		Recycling Education to businesses owned by refugees	
E	COAM		\$5,220.00	Incomplete		Compost education workshop	
E	The Glass Bandit LLC	X	\$40,000.00			Truck for collecting glass curbside	Note regarding all Region E Preliminary Applications Listed Here: Pre-application amounts "requested" are not actually

District	Organization	Preliminary Application-Did Not Submit Final Application (X)	Amount Requested	Low Score or Incomplete	Insufficient Grant Funds	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
							requests but project cost projections. The pre-applicants did not submit final applications.
E	Avenue of Life	X	\$28,900.00			Equipment to set up wood shop using wood from mattresses.	
E	Gravatt Waste Solutions	X	\$137,500.00			Dumpsters and truck for recycling	
E	Ethan Ferguson Ticao	X	\$6,000.00			Precious Plastics machine.	
E	Heartland All Species Project	X	\$26,550.00			Limb collection for bio-char	
E	The Sewing Labs	X	\$8,100.00			Sewing machine recycling	
E	Scandinavia Co-op	X	\$49,950.00			Concrete recycling and reuse	
E	City of North Kansas City	X	\$20,000.00			Recycling trailer for roving site	
E	Compost Collective	X	\$12,000.00			Driver to support curbside compost business	
E	Cass County Sustainability Committee	X	\$6,500.00			Educational materials on recycling to residents	
E	Renew Missouri	X	\$47,500.00			Multi-family recycling program	
E	City of Independence	X	\$57,995.00			Debris street cleaner machine	
E	Kansas City Zoo	X	\$29,000.00			Food waste composting	
E	Project Central/Tellus	X	\$133,000.00			Lunch room composting	
E	Mid-Continent Library	X	\$20,137.00			Reuse water filling stations	
E	Avenue of Life II	X	\$26,730.00			Education on mattress recycling	
E	Kansas City Public Schools	X	\$49,000.00			Composting at East High School	
E	US Green Building Council	X	\$10,000.00			Market development and education on recycling	

District	Organization	Preliminary Application-Did Not Submit Final Application (X)	Amount Requested	Low Score or Incomplete	Insufficient Grant Funds	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
E	Revolution Energy LLC	X	\$165,000.00			Source recycled plastic for constructing photovoltaics	
E	Truman Heritage Habitat for Humanity	X	\$40,280.00			Residential construction and demolition waste	
E	City of North Kansas City II	X	\$7,000.00			Glass bin containers for residents	
E	The Tellus Group	X	\$48,210.00			Education to contractors on C&D Recycling	
F <sup>6</sup>	Pioneer Trails RPC (2018)		\$37,000.00			Education programs for the district.	District contracted with a different entity for DO/PI.
F	City of Marshall Utilities (2018)		\$30,000.00			Pit Conveyor for bailer.	Withdrew application due to 15% match requirement.
F	J.S Disposal (2018)		\$25,457.50			Skid loader	Withdrew application due to 15% match requirement.
F	City of Alma (2018)		\$30,556.65	Low Score	X	Roofing project for shelter houses	Had funded approximately \$70,000 the prior two years.
F	City of Higginsville (2018)		\$2,888.16	Low Score	X	Message board for cemetery	Low score and no funds left.
F	Malta Bend Road District (2018)		\$42,500.00	Low Score	X	Crush concrete to be reused.	Low score and no funds left.
F	Missouri University of Science & Technology (2018)		\$50,000.00	Incomplete application	X	Fly ash study.	District does not pay wages.
F	Remington Arms (2018)		\$50,000.00	Incomplete application	X		Incomplete application.
F	Missouri University of Science & Technology (2018)		\$50,000.00	Incomplete application	X	Rubberized concrete study.	Did not have required match.
G	No unfunded grants						
H	City of Jefferson	X	\$34,500.00			Relocation/Construction of	

<sup>6</sup> At the time this report was completed, Region F had not submitted grant information for 2019. The grants listed here were reported for 2018.

District	Organization	Preliminary Application-Did Not Submit Final Application (X)	Amount Requested	Low Score or Incomplete	Insufficient Grant Funds	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
						new glass bunker	
H	University of Missouri-Columbia	X	\$100,000.00			Purchase Bagger and Compost Screener for MU Campus to begin composting operations.	
H	SpaceShark Studios		\$9,700.00	X		Continued Development of WasteCraft game from H2017-009	
H	SpaceShark Studios		\$9,250.00	X		Development of DumpDefender mobile platform game based on H2017-009	
H	Central Missouri Food Bank		\$100,000.00			Purchase new refrigerated box truck to run collection routes	Based on the final rankings, the remaining funds would not be enough for the full project. We offered the lesser dollar amount, but the Food Bank declined because it would not be sufficient for their needs.
I	No unfunded grants						
J	In-the Green Productions		\$9,000.00	Low Score		Educational presentations in schools.	Evaluated and ranked below funding availability
J	Hudson R-9 PTO		\$10,000	Low Score		Education and playground equipment	Evaluated and ranked below funding availability
K	Operation Clean Up Maries County		\$14,895.00	Low Score		County trash patrol and clean-up of illegal dumps.	This was a reoccurring project. Scorers liked pieces of the project but it did not score above 70%. The applicant was referred to the District's Community Outreach and Assistance program for support with their supplies and recycling expenses.
K	Phelps County – Tough		\$12,350.00	Low Score		County trash patrol and clean-	This was a reoccurring project.

District	Organization	Preliminary Application-Did Not Submit Final Application (X)	Amount Requested	Low Score or Incomplete	Insufficient Grant Funds	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
	on Trash					up of illegal dump activities. Coordination of a volunteer roadway cleanup program.	Referred to the District's Community Outreach and Assistance for support with their supplies and recycling expenses.
K	MO S&T		\$9,614.00	Low Score		In conjunction with the MO S&T Solar Village, a project to identify PV recycling resources, opportunities for PV recycling markets in Missouri and development of educational materials.	As photovoltaic recycling is not on the target material list, the ranking score was below the funding requirement of 70%. The applicant was referred to the District's Community Outreach and Assistance fund for further consideration of pieces of the project.
K	Glen Co Investments of Rolla – electronics recycling		\$9,800.00	Low Score		Purchase of trailers for collecting and storing electronics and scrap material.	The application from this electronics refurbishing/recycling businesses fell below the funding scale. There were also concerns with unfair competition with other similar businesses.
K	Design 4 U – Reclaim/Upcycle Project in Rolla		\$132,202.77	Low Score		Purchase of tools, workshop machinery and staff salary for the development of a makers studio with a focus on reusing recycled materials.	The incomplete application from this start-up business fell below the funding scale.
L	Affordable Mattress		\$79,000.00		X	Collection of old mattresses/box springs and transformed into refurbished bedding for resale.	Equipment - 7 used trailers; Direct costs - warehouse rent
L	City of Maplewood		\$3,294.00		X	Composting carts will be provided for residents to deposit organic waste.	Subcontracting - composting services

District	Organization	Preliminary Application-Did Not Submit Final Application (X)	Amount Requested	Low Score or Incomplete	Insufficient Grant Funds	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	Cluff Inc.		\$20,208.54		X	A district-wide public opinion survey.	Personnel - (1) - Principal; Subcontracting - data collection provider
L	DC Foam Recycling, Inc.		\$36,720.00		X	Carpet recycler to replace obsolete analyzers with hand-held ID equipment necessary to determine fiber types.	Equipment - fiber identification system
L	Dutchtown South Community Corporation		\$44,575.25		X	Neighborhoods in the Dutchtown South will reduce litter, improper waste disposal, and illegal dumping.	Personnel - (1) - Recycling Route Driver; Equipment - used box truck; Direct costs
L	Hansen's Tree, Lawn and Landscaping Services, Inc.		\$28,000.00		X	Wood, pallets, yard waste, etc., is processed to capture and remove metals for proper reuse.	Equipment - cross belt magnet
L	Hansen's Tree, Lawn and Landscaping Services, Inc.		\$4,283.00		X	Hold a composting seminar for contractors, landscapers, and landscape architects.	Direct costs - insurance, printing, postage, chairs/tables, tents, shuttle, etc.
L	Jewish Family & Children's Service		\$48,890.46		X	Produce and other perishables cannot be used will be composted.	Personnel - (2) existing; Equipment - baler install and electricity; Direct costs and Subcontracting
L	Lens Masters, Inc.		\$34,121.00		X	Fluorescent lamps and ballasts are collected for recycling.	Equipment - enclosed cargo trailer, Direct costs - boxes for transporting lamps
L	Mercy Health Foundation St. Louis		\$35,727.00		X	Medical complex to add to the automated pick up and drop off of office and clinic recycling.	Equipment - Autonomour Robotic TUG; Direct costs
L	Missouri Life		\$24,200.00		X	Raising awareness of proper recycling procedures.	Direct costs - 1 to 8 issues and social media content
L	Ritenour Co-Care		\$37,064.00		X	Food pantry to obtain a replacement truck to pick up food donations.	Equipment - new truck with lift-gate

District	Organization	Preliminary Application-Did Not Submit Final Application (X)	Amount Requested	Low Score or Incomplete	Insufficient Grant Funds	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
L	St. Louis American Foundation		\$18,000.00		X	The Newspapers In Education program includes recycling sections.	Direct costs - 10-part 1/4 page, full-color, 10 features
L	St. Louis Composting, Inc.		\$58,000.00		X	Installing a concrete pad to enable loading/unloading at the de-packager.	Equipment - free-standing truck dock and aprons
L	St. Louis Produce Market, Inc.		\$49,500.00		X	A newly-established in-house recycling center.	Equipment - track loader
L	St. Patrick Center		\$35,000.00		X	Providing homeless men with jobs skills training in the recycling and waste management industry.	Personnel - (2) Direct costs
L	Total Organics Recycling, Inc.		\$120,712.10		X	Initiating the collection of curbside residential composting.	Equipment - collection truck; Direct costs - kitchen compost bins, curbside bins
L	Total Metal Recycling		\$45,000.00		X	Offsetting the cost of dismantling CRTs for the end user of the leaded glass.	Personnel - (3) - Commercial Buyer, 2 Electronics; Dismantling Laborers
L	University of MO - University Extension		\$49,402.00		X	University to develop a new market for recycled plastic.	Personnel - (3+) Professor, Technician, Graduate; Direct costs
M	Noble Earth Recovery		\$ 8,257.00	X		Building/warehouse rent, environmental consultant fees, supplies, and repairs.	Low score due to new business with little experience and no certifications.
M	City of Webb City	X	\$ 18,500.00			Funding for annual recycle event - including staff, e-waste and HHW contractors.	Final application was received after deadline.
N	Lawrence County – County Clerk		\$17,240.00		X	This grant was to fund the purchase of a paper shredder to be used by all organizations within the Lawrence County courthouse, and surrounding	Due to the District N being a minimum funded district, and grant applications exceeded available grant funds, this application scored the lowest, so

District	Organization	Preliminary Application-Did Not Submit Final Application (X)	Amount Requested	Low Score or Incomplete	Insufficient Grant Funds	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
O	Hansen's Tree Service		\$48,000.00	X		business and judicial system. All paper was to be recycled at the Monett Area Sheltered Workshop.	the Board voted not to fund due to limited funding resources.
O	Burrell Working Solutions		\$25,630.00	X		The grant request was for funding for a building to house indoor recycling bins and storage of materials.	
O	Christian County		\$10,500.00	X		The grant request was for a box truck and collection bins to pick up office paper in the community.	
O	Elizabeth Pollard		\$48,000.00	X		Project would have provided paper-shredding services to residents of Christian County at their local recycling center.	
P	Couch R-I School District		\$ 30,000.00	X		Application was submitted with incomplete information. Project would have included a machine to melt plastic that could then be used to make a variety of items, including crafts and artwork.	
						Wages to clean out school of hoarded paper and material, purchase of a truck and trailer to haul and purchase of a paper shredder to shred sensitive documents	The board determined that the grant application did not indicate that any waste would be diverted from landfills by the applicant. However, the board elected to fund the district \$1,700 from the illegal dumping account

District	Organization	Preliminary Application-Did Not Submit Final Application (X)	Amount Requested	Low Score or Incomplete	Insufficient Grant Funds	Grant Request Summary	Funding Notes
P	Ozark Vinyl LLC		\$ 30,000.00	X		Purchase of a PVC processing unit and stand	This decision was primarily due to the fact that the grant was not as explanatory as to the need and uses for the funds as the Board would like to have known, and no invited member of the organization was present to explain the questions.
Q	No unfunded projects for 2019.						
R	No unfunded projects for 2018.						
S	No unfunded projects for 2019.						
T <sup>7</sup>	Camdenton Recycling		\$15,903.00		Electric magnet with generator.		\$1,857 in matching funds provided.
T	City of Lebanon		\$10,540.40		HHW collection		\$27,284.82 in matching funds provided for a total project of \$37,825.22.

<sup>7</sup> At the time this report was completed, Region T had not submitted grant information for 2019. The grants listed here were reported for 2018.



## ATTACHMENT C

### PROPOSED REVISIONS

#### 10 CSR 80-9.050 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FUND—DISTRICT GRANTS

# Rules of Department of Natural Resources

## Division 80—Solid Waste Management Chapter 9—Solid Waste Management Fund

### 10 CSR 80-9.050 Solid Waste Management Fund—District Grants

#### Title 10—DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

##### Division 80—Solid Waste Management

###### Chapter 9—Solid Waste Management Fund

### 10 CSR 80-9.050 Solid Waste Management Fund—District Grants

*PURPOSE: This rule contains procedures and provisions for solid waste management districts to qualify for grant funds from the Solid Waste Management Fund as provided for in section 260.335.2, RSMo.*

*PUBLISHER'S NOTE: The publication of the full text of the material that the adopting agency has incorporated by reference in this rule would be unduly cumbersome or expensive. Therefore, the full text of that material will be made available to any interested person at both the Office of the Secretary of State and the office of the adopting agency, pursuant to section 536.031.4, RSMo. Such material will be provided at the cost established by state law.*

(1) Definitions. Definitions for key words used in this rule may be found in 10 CSR 80-2.010.

Additional definitions specific to this rule are as follows:

(A) Allocated district funds. Monies from the Solid Waste Management Fund that are set aside to be disbursed to each district by the department;

(B) Competitive bid process. Procurement of goods or services that follows the guidelines outlined in 1 CSR 40;

(C) Disbursed district funds. District funds paid to each district or ~~subgranteegrantee~~;

(D) Disposal cost. Fees charged to collect, transport or deposit solid waste in a landfill, transfer station or other approved facility;

~~(E) District administrative grant. Planning and organizational grants disbursed by the department to each district prior to August 28, 2004;~~

(F) District carryover. Any remaining district funds of any completed grants that have been disbursed by the department to each district for ~~district administrative grants~~, district operations grants, plan implementation grants or district ~~subgrantsgrants~~;

(G) District funds. The revenue generated from the solid waste tonnage fee collected and deposited in the Solid Waste Management Fund and allocated to each district pursuant to section 260.335.2, RSMo, plus district carryover, and interest income earned ~~and state required local match funds~~;

(H) Executive board. The board established by each district's solid waste management council or by the alternative management structure chosen by a district as provided for in section 260.315.4(2), RSMo;

(I) Interest income. All interest earned by each district from the holding of revenue generated from the Solid Waste Management Fund;

(J) Project. All approved components of an organized undertaking described in a proposal, including any supporting documents as required by project type;

(K) Solid Waste Management Fund. The fund created in section 260.330, RSMo, to receive the tonnage fee charges submitted by sanitary and demolition landfills for waste disposed of in Missouri and transfer stations for waste transported out of state for disposal;

(L) State required local match funds. Funds committed by local governments to each district as match for district administrative grants; and

(M) Unencumbered district funds. District funds that have not been obligated by the executive board for goods and services in the form of purchase orders, contracts or other form of documentation.

(2) Eligibility.

(A) Applicability. This rule applies to the members of the executive boards of all department-recognized solid waste management districts in Missouri.

(B) Projects. The district funds are to be allocated for projects in accordance with the following provisions:

~~1. Grant monies made available by this rule shall be allocated by the district for projects contained within the district's approved solid waste management plan.~~ These funds will be used for solid waste management projects as approved by the ~~department.executive board~~. However, no grant funds will be made available for incineration without energy recovery;

~~2. In the event that the district solid waste management plan has not been submitted to the department, any eligible projects approved by the district and allocated monies made available by this rule shall be included in the district's solid waste management plan prior to submission;~~

~~3. In the event that the district solid waste management plan has been submitted to the department, any eligible projects approved by the district and allocated monies made available by this rule, but not contained within the plan, shall be considered an addenda to the plan. The addenda will be evidenced in quarterly and final project reports required under subsection (6)(B) of this rule. Projects serving as addenda to the plan in this manner must be included in any documents required by the department to be submitted by the districts that update the plan or that verify implementation of the plan pursuant to section 260.325.5, RSMo;~~

4. District funds shall not be awarded for a project whose applicant is directly involved in the evaluation and ranking of that particular project;

5. District funds shall not be awarded for a project that displaces existing resource recovery services, unless the proposed project demonstrates how it will result in improvement or expansion of service; and

6. District funds shall not be awarded for a project that collects curbside municipal solid waste solid waste for disposal on a continuous basis.

(C) Grant Funds.Funding:

1. As determined by statute, an amount of the revenue generated from the solid waste tonnage fee collected and deposited in the Solid Waste Management Fund shall be allocated annually to the executive board of each officially recognized solid waste management district for district grants. Further, each officially recognized solid waste management district shall be allocated, upon appropriation, a minimum amount for district grants pursuant to section 260.335.2, RSMo.

2. ~~The district shall enter into a financial assistance agreement with the department prior to the disbursement of district funds.~~ The financial assistance agreement shall, at a minimum, specify that all district funds will be managed in accordance with statute and this rule. Financial assistance agreements shall be provided to the districts by the department at the beginning of the state fiscal year.

3. Quarterly the department shall notify transfer to the executive board of each district of the amount of grant funds for which the district is eligible. Upon request, the department will provide to a district the reported tonnages and tonnage fees paid into the Solid Waste Management Fund. The Districts shall utilize funds in accordance with state statute and this rule.

4. ~~Grant money available to a district under subsection (2)(C) of this rule within a fiscal year may be allocated for district operations, projects that further plan implementation and~~

~~subgranteee projects of cities and counties within the district pursuant to section 260.335.2, RSMo.~~

~~5. Any district funds allocated to a district but not requested by the district following the procedures outlined in this rule within twenty-four (24) months of the end of the state fiscal year in which it was allocated may be reallocated by the department pursuant to section 260.335.2, RSMo.~~

~~6. At the end of a district's fiscal year, any district carryover funds from closed district grants and interest income in excess of twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) shall be allocated for projects other than district operations in the district's next request for project proposals in accordance with section 260.335, RSMo, unless approved by the department.~~

~~7. A solid waste management district may elect to use more than one fiscal year's allocation of funds to finance a project. Prior to the department encumbering funds for this project, the district shall notify submit a request to the department for approval that provides justification and financial supporting documentation.~~

~~8. Following the department's approval, the district may request that these funds be transmitted to the district. All interest income earned by the district shall be obligated to this project until the total amount needed is reached.~~

~~9. All district funds shall be used for implementation of a solid waste management plan, district operations and, solid waste management, waste reduction, recycling and related services grants and plan implementation projects as approved by the district executive board and the department.~~

~~(D) Costs. In general, the following paragraphs list eligible and ineligible costs for district funds. Items not listed in this section or in subsections (3)(A) and (4)(B) should may be discussed with the department approved by the district executive board, after discussions with the department.~~

1. Eligible costs. Applicants can request monetary assistance in the operation of eligible projects for the following types of costs. Eligible costs may vary depending on the services, materials and activities, as specified in the grant application:

- A. Collection, processing, manufacturing or hauling equipment;
- B. Materials and labor for construction of buildings;
- C. Engineering or consulting fees;
- D. Salaries and related fringe benefits directly related to the project;
- E. Equipment installation costs including installation, freight or retrofitting of the equipment;
- F. Development and distribution of informational materials;
- G. Planning and implementation of informational forums including, but not limited to, workshops;
- H. Travel as necessary for project completion
- I. Overhead costs directly related to the project;
- J. Laboratory analysis costs; and
- K. Professional services.

2. Ineligible costs. The following costs are considered ineligible for district grant funding:

A. Operating expenses, such as salaries and expenses that are not directly related to district operations or the project activities;

- B. Costs incurred before the project start date or after the project end date;

C. ~~State Sales Taxes;~~

D. Legal costs;

E. Contingency funds;

F. Land acquisition;

G. Gifts;

H. Disposal costs, except for ~~electronics, household hazardous waste, or other diversion projects as deemed appropriate by district executive boards.projects as indicated in paragraph (2)(B)6. of this rule;~~

I. Fines and penalties;

J. Food and beverages for district employees, board members or ~~grants subgrantee grantees~~ at non-working meetings;

- K. Memorial donations for board members, district employees, or ~~grants-subgrantee grantees~~;
- L. Office decorations, except as indicated in paragraph (3)(A)4. of this rule; and
- M. Lobbyists, pursuant to section 105.470, RSMo.

(3) District Operations.

(A) Eligible Costs. The department shall allocate funding for the costs that are reasonable and necessary for proper and efficient performance and administration of the district. District operations costs must be specifically for the purpose of district operations and may include:

1. Salaries and related fringe benefits of employees;
2. Cost of materials and supplies acquired, consumed or expended;
3. Rental or leasing of office space;
4. Office decorations costing less than five hundred dollars (\$500) per year;
5. Equipment and other capital expenditures;
6. Travel expenses incurred;
7. The cost of utilities, insurance, security, janitorial services, upkeep of grounds, normal repairs and alterations and the like to the extent that they keep property at an efficient operating condition, do not add to the permanent value of property or appreciably prolong the intended life and are not otherwise included in rental or other charges for space;
8. Contracted services for eligible costs acquired through a competitive bid process;
9. Non-cash service awards which are reasonable in cost; and
10. Legal costs for contract review and other costs directly related to the district ~~grant~~ administration.

(B) ~~District Operations Budget~~Grant Application. Districts eligible to ~~Expend receive~~ district operations ~~grant~~ funding shall ~~Provide submit~~ a written ~~notice request~~ to the department, on forms provided by the department, that includes:

1. A completed district operations budget, containing such detail as specified by the department, that has been approved by the executive board, including an executive summary and list of tasks for the budget period.
2. Copies of any contracts in effect for district operations services.
3. ~~If applicable, documentation of the bidding process used to procure district operations services.~~
4. The grant and budget period shall cover up to a one (1)-year time period, unless otherwise approved by the department.
5. Districts may ~~apply submit~~ for district operations funds at any time during the year, provided that all requirements outlined in this section are followed.

(4) Plan Implementation Projects.

(A) Projects. The ~~department~~district executive board ~~may shall~~ allocate plan implementation funds for projects in accordance with the following provisions:

1. ~~Grant monies~~Funds made available by this rule shall be allocated by the district for projects contained within the district's solid waste management plan or which enable the district to plan and implement activities pursuant to section 260.325, RSMo;
2. Projects shall be conducted by district staff or through a contract with the district. Contracted services must be procured through a competitive bid process;
3. ~~Projects should benefit the counties or cities who are members of the district; and~~
4. A project period shall be determined that allows for the purpose of the project to be accomplished and for adequate reporting of the results of the project to determine if the project met its intended goals. Project and budget periods may allow for up to a two (2)-year time period for project completion. ~~An extension may be approved beyond the 2-year time period by the district executive board. maximum of one (1) six (6)-month extension may be allowed beyond the two (2) years when approved by the executive board.~~

~~Any extension of the project or budget periods beyond two (2) years and six (6) months must have the prior approval of the executive board and the department.~~

(B) Eligible Costs. Districts may ~~request monetary assistance allocate funds~~ in the operation of eligible plan implementation projects for the types of costs listed in paragraph (2)(D)1. of this rule. Eligible costs may also include costs associated with revising the district's solid waste management plan.

(C) Grant Application Budgets. Districts eligible to receive plan implementation ~~grant~~ funding shall submit ~~a written request notice~~ to the department that includes copies of all plan implementation project proposals approved by the executive board as documented in meeting minutes. At a minimum, project proposals must include:

1. An executive summary of the project objectives and the problem to be solved, referencing the district's solid waste management plan, if applicable, component to which it applies;
2. The location of the project, project name, and the project number assigned by the district;
3. A work plan which identifies project tasks, the key personnel and their qualifications;
4. A timetable showing anticipated dates for major planned activities and expenditures, including the submittal of ~~quarterly a final reports and the final report~~;
5. A budget that includes an estimate of the costs for conducting the project. Estimates shall be provided for all major planned activities or purchases by category;
6. Documentation that all required proposal content has been received and reviewed by the district executive board including cost estimates, verification that all applicable federal, state and local permits, approvals, licenses or waivers necessary to implement the project are either not needed or have been applied for, and demonstration of compliance with local zoning ordinances;
7. The type of waste and estimated tonnage to be diverted from landfills or other measurable outcomes;
8. A description of the evaluation procedures to be used throughout the project to measure the success or benefit of the project;
9. For projects involving awards over fifty thousand dollars (\$~~50100~~,000), supporting documentation must be provided to demonstrate technical feasibility, including a preliminary project design, preliminary engineering plans and specifications for any facilities and equipment required for a proposed project, if applicable; and ~~10. If requested by the department, copies of any or all approved project proposals and supporting documents.~~

(5) District GrantSubgranteeGrantee Procedures.

(A) Notification by the Districts. The district executive boards shall request project proposals by giving written notification to the governing officials of each member county and city over five hundred (500) in population. ~~and by publishing a notice in a newspaper officially designated by the chief elected official of each member county, for public notices for every member county and city with a population over five hundred (500) within the district. The district executive board shall provide the written notification and newspaper notice at least thirty (30) days prior to when proposals are due. If the district executive board will request project proposals more often than annually, the district executive board may issue the written notification and newspaper notice annually specifying when the district will be accepting project proposals for the upcoming year.~~

(B) Proposal Content and Supporting Documents. The districts shall, as appropriate, require the proposals to include but not be limited to the following information:

1. An executive summary of the project objectives and the problem to be solved, referencing the district's solid waste management plan component to which it applies;
2. The location of the project and name, address and phone number of the official subgrant recipient(s);

3. A work plan which identifies project tasks, the key personnel and their qualifications;
  4. A timetable showing anticipated dates for major planned activities and expenditures, including the submittal of ~~quarterly reports and~~ the final report;
  5. A budget that includes an estimate of the costs for conducting the project. Estimates shall be provided for all major planned activities or purchases by category and shall be supported by documentation showing how each cost estimate was determined. If the project includes matching funds, the budget must delineate the percentages and dollar amounts of the total project costs for both district funds and applicant contributions;
  6. Verification that all applicable federal, state and local permits, approvals, licenses or waivers necessary to implement the project are either not needed or have been obtained or applied for and will be obtained prior to an award;
  7. Demonstration of compliance with local zoning ordinances;
  8. A description of the evaluation procedures to be used throughout the project to quantitatively and qualitatively measure the success or benefit of the project;
  9. Documentation that shows a commitment for the match, if applicable;
10. The following supporting documents for projects, except education projects, involving allocations over fifty thousand dollars (\$~~50100~~,000), if applicable:
- A. To demonstrate technical feasibility, a preliminary project design, preliminary engineering plans and specifications for any facilities and equipment required for a proposed project, if applicable;
  - B. A financial report including:
    - (I) A three (3)-year business or strategic plan for the proposed project. ~~For projects involving recycling and reuse technologies, the plan shall include a market analysis with information demonstrating that the applicant has secured the supply of and demand for recovered material and recycled products necessary for sustained business activity;~~
    - (II) A description of project financing, including projected revenue from the project; and
    - (III) A confidential credit history; and/or up to three (3) years' previous financial statements or reports; or for governmental entities a bond rating;
11. Confidential business information and availability of information. Any person may assert a claim of business confidentiality covering a part or all of that information by including a letter with the information which requests protection of specific information from disclosure. Confidentiality shall be determined or granted in accordance with Chapter 610, RSMo. However, if no claim accompanies the information when it is received by the ~~department~~ district, the information may be made available to the public without further notice to the person submitting it; and
12. In the event that more than one (1) solid waste management district proposes to participate in a project as joint subgrantee-grantees, each participating district's responsibilities will be outlined in the subgrantee-grantee Financial Assistance Agreement. One (1) of the participating districts must be designated as project manager. The project will be administered as provided for in sections (5) and (6) of this rule.
- (C) A project period shall be determined that will allow an adequate time period for the subgrantee to accomplish the purpose of the project and provide reporting of the results and accomplishments. Project and budget periods may allow for up to a two (2) year time period for project completion. A n extension may be approved beyond the 2-year time period by the district executive board, maximum of one (1) six (6) month extension may be allowed beyond the two (2) years when approved by the executive board. Any extension of the project or budget periods beyond two (2) years and six (6) months must have the prior approval of the executive board and the department.
- (D) Proposal Review and Evaluation. The executive boards must review, rank and approve proposals as outlined in this subsection. The executive board may appoint a committee to review and rank proposals. The executive board shall make final approval.

1. Review for eligibility and completeness. For all proposals received by the deadline as established in their public notices to the media, the board shall determine the eligibility of the applicant, the eligibility of the proposed project, the eligibility of the costs identified in the proposal and the completeness of the proposal.
  2. Notice of eligibility and completeness. If the district executive board determines that the applicant or the project is ineligible or incomplete, the board may reject the proposal and shall notify the applicant. A project may be resubmitted up to the application deadline.
  3. Proposal evaluation. The executive board or their appointed committee shall evaluate each proposal that is determined to be eligible and complete. The board will develop a District Targeted Materials List to be used as one of the evaluation criteria. The evaluation method will include the following criteria, as appropriate per project category:
    - A. Conformance with the integrated waste management hierarchy as described in the *Missouri Policy on Resource Recovery*, as incorporated by reference in this rule;
    - B. Conformance with the District Targeted Materials List;
    - C. Degree to which the project contributes to community-based economic development;
    - D. ~~District funds shall not be awarded for a project that displaces existing resource recovery services, unless the proposed project demonstrates how it will result in improvement or expansion of service.~~ Degree to which funding to the project will adversely affect existing private entities in the market segment; ~~(re-write to cater to eval criteria)~~
    - E. Degree to which the project promotes waste reduction or recycling or results in an environmental benefit related to solid waste management through the proposed process;
    - F. ~~Demonstrates cooperative efforts through a public/private partnership or among political subdivisions;~~
    - G. Compliance with federal, state or local requirements;
    - H. ~~Transferability of results;~~
    - I. ~~The need for the information;~~
    - J. Technical ~~and managerial~~ ability of the applicant;
    - K. ~~Managerial ability of the applicant;~~
    - L. Ability to implement in a timely manner;
    - M. Technical feasibility;
    - N. Availability of feedstock;
    - O. Level of commitment for financing; ~~and~~
    - P. ~~Type of contribution by applicant;~~
    - Q. ~~Effectiveness of marketing strategy;~~
    - R. Quality of budget; ~~and~~
    - S. ~~Selected financial ratios.~~
  4. The executive board shall develop minimum criteria for the approval of ~~project grant~~ funding
- (6) District Documentation.
- (A) ~~Grant subgrantee~~ Proposals. The following documentation must be submitted by the district to the department as part of the grant ~~application documentation~~ process:
1. A completed project request summary form provided by the department that includes, at a minimum, the following information:
    - A. Copies of the executive summaries of the eligible proposals submitted to the executive board, or narratives prepared by the district, that describe the location of project, project objectives, tasks and general timeline of each eligible proposal;
    - B. For each project approved for an award by the executive board indicate the name of the project, the project number assigned by the district and:
      - (I) The total amount awarded to each project, what amount is awarded from the current undisbursed allocation funding, any carryover from previous awards by the district and the source of the carryover, and any interest accrued by the district;
      - (II) The project budget by category;

- (III) The type of waste and estimated tonnage to be diverted from landfills or other measurable outcomes;
  - (IV) The project start and stop dates; and
  - (V) Application checklist shall serve as documentation that all required proposal content has been received and reviewed by the district;
2. The aggregate executive board rankings for each of the eligible proposals or documentation that the proposals meet the minimum criteria for funding set by the executive board using the evaluation criteria as described in paragraph (5)(D)3.;
  3. ~~If requested by the department, copies of any or all approved project proposals and supporting documents;~~
  4. A copy of the notices given to the governing bodies ~~and published in the newspapers within the district within the district;~~
  5. A copy of the subgrantee-grantee(s) financial assistance agreement between the district and subgrantee-grantee(s), any amendments made to the subgrantee-grantee(s) financial assistance agreement indicated in subsection (7)(H) of this rule and invoice; and
  6. Documentation that the executive board discussions and votes for approved subgrants~~grants~~ took place in open session, in accordance with sections 610.010 to 610.200 of the Missouri Sunshine Law.
- (B) Quarterly Reports Semi-annual Status Reports. On ~~quarterly status semi-annual~~ report forms provided by the department, the district shall submit the following information to the department thirty (30) days after the end of each 6-month period state fiscal year quarter:
1. Project status. For each ~~plan implementation and~~ district subgrantee grant project in progress the district shall provide:
    - A. The details of progress addressing the project tasks outlined in the ~~plan implementation application or subgrantee-grantee~~ financial assistance agreement;
    - B. Problems encountered in project execution;
    - C. Budget adjustments made within budget categories, with justifications;
    - D. The weight in tons of waste diverted for each type of recovered material utilized in the project for the most recent quarter 6-month period following the implementation of the diversion activity or other measurable outcomes, as appropriate;
    - E. A copy of an amended subgrantee-grantee financial assistance agreement, if appropriate; and
    - F. Other information necessary for proper evaluation of the progress of the projects.
  2. In the event that a time period for a project is less than a full year, only ~~quarterly semi-annual~~ information appropriate to the project time period need be included in the district report.
  3. Project financial summary. For each grant (district operations, plan implementation and district subgrantee-grantee project) the district shall provide:
    - A. The original award amount taken from the accrued allocation ~~held by the department~~;
    - B. Any district carryover used to fund a project or district operations;
    - C. Any accrued interest income used to fund a project or district operations;
    - D. Total grant award for that project or district operation (total of subparagraphs (6)(B)3.A., B., and C. of this rule);
    - E. Cumulative amount of district disbursement of funds to each subgrantee-grantee or to the district during that reporting period;
    - F. Balance of that project or district operations during that reporting period;
    - G. Any carryover funding held by the district that has not been obligated for projects or district operations; and
    - H. Any accrued interest income held by the district that has not been obligated for projects or district operations.
  4. Final project reports. The district shall submit to the department a final report for each plan implementation or district subgrantee grant project that shall contain the same information as described for project status in paragraph

(6)(B)1. of this rule, as well as a comparison of actual accomplishments to the goals established and a description as to how goals were either met, not met or were exceeded.

5. District operations status:

A. The details of progress in completing the district operations tasks outlined in the district operations ~~budget application~~:

- B. Problems encountered in district operations;
- C. Required budget amendments; and

D. ~~Other information necessary for proper evaluation of district operations.~~

(C) District Annual Report. The district shall submit to the department within one hundred twenty (120) days of the end of the state fiscal year a report covering the following information for the state fiscal year:

1. Goals and accomplishments. A description of the district solid waste management goals, actions taken to achieve those goals and the goals that have been set for the upcoming state fiscal year;

2. Types of projects and results, including:

A. A summary of the projects that included goals to divert solid waste tonnage from landfills, including number and costs of projects, tons diverted and average cost per ton diverted, and other measurable outcomes achieved;

B. A summary of the projects that did not have waste diversion goals, including number and costs of projects, and measurable outcomes achieved; and

C. Separate statistics for items banned by statute from landfills and items that are not banned from landfills;

3. A description of the district's grant proposal evaluation process; and

4. A list of district council and executive board members, including their affiliation(s).

(7) Executive Board Accountability.

(A) The executive board shall comply with the department's reporting requirements, pursuant to section (6) of this rule.

(B) An executive board receiving funds from the Solid Waste Management Fund for district grants shall themselves maintain, and require recipients of financial assistance to maintain, an accounting system according to generally accepted accounting principles that accurately reflects all fiscal transactions, incorporates appropriate controls and safeguards, and provides clear references to the project as agreed to in the Financial Assistance Agreement. Accounting records must be supported by source documentation such as cancelled checks, paid bills, payrolls, time and attendance records, contract, and agreement award documents.

(C) The executive board shall adopt a conflict of interest policy regarding grants ~~to~~ ~~subgrantees~~. This policy shall include a requirement that any non-governmental member of the executive board, or the business or institution to which the member is affiliated, who applies for district grants shall not review, score, rank or approve any of the ~~subgrantee grant~~ applications for the same grant call.

(D) Payments to grant recipients shall be on a reimbursement basis. The executive board shall retain fifteen percent (15%) of the funds from the recipient until the project is complete. A project shall be deemed complete when the project period has ended and the board gives approval to the grant recipient's final report and the final accounting of project expenditures. The district may make payment directly to a vendor instead of reimbursing the grant recipient provided the executive board approves the direct payment, goods or services being purchased by the grant recipient have been received, and the executive board retains fifteen percent (15%) of the funds until completion of the grant project. For reimbursements or direct payments, the district may release the fifteen percent (15%) retainage prior to completion of the grant project with prior approval of the executive board and the department.

(E) Retention and Custodial Requirements for Records.

1. The executive board shall retain all records and supporting documents directly related to the funds and projects for a period of three (3) years from the date of submission of the final status report and make them available to the department for audit or examination.

2. If any litigation, claim, negotiation, audit or other action involving the records has been started before the expiration of the three (3)-year period, the records must be retained until completion of the action and resolution of all issues which arise from it, or until the end of the regular three (3)-year period, whichever is later.

(F) All general and special terms and conditions of the ~~department~~district applicable to the project will be applicable to recipients of awards made available by this chapter.

(G) The executive board shall address all deficiencies identified in a district's audit to the satisfaction of the department. Districts failing to adequately address deficiencies identified in the audit may have funds withheld or may be required to repay any and all disbursements of funds in accordance with section (9) of this rule.

~~(H) Funding for approved subgrants will be forwarded to the districts upon receipt of a completed, signed and dated invoice and subgrantee financial assistance agreement for each individual subgrant.~~

~~(I) Except as otherwise provided by law, within eighteen (18) months after the effective date of this rule, the executive board shall use a competitive bid process to obtain administrative services, office space rental, and other district operations services, except for employees who are directly employed by the district. Contracts shall not exceed five (5) years in duration.~~

(J) The executive board shall have their records audited by a certified public accountant or firm of certified public accountants pursuant to section 260.325, RSMo. Districts shall arrange to have the audit conducted and submit to the department a complete audit report prepared by the certified public accountant or firm of certified public accountants within one hundred eighty (180) days of the end of the period covered by the audit. (re-write to reflect current statutes)

(K) For capital assets over ~~ten~~five thousand dollars (\$~~105~~,000) purchased in whole or in part with district funds and in which a security interest is held, the executive board must maintain property records. At a minimum these records shall include a description of the equipment, a serial number or other identification number, ~~the source of the property~~the name of the seller, the acquisition date, cost of the property, percentage of state funds used in the cost of the property, and the location, use and condition of the property.

(L) The executive board shall insure that a physical inventory is conducted of property purchased with district funds and the results reconciled with the property records at least once every two (2) years.

(M) For capital assets over ~~ten~~five thousand dollars (\$~~105~~,000) purchased in whole or in part with district funds, by the district or ~~subgrantee~~grantee, the executive board shall ensure that insurance is procured and maintained that will cover loss or damage to the capital assets with financially sound and reputable insurance companies or through self-insurance, in such amounts and covering such risks as are usually carried by companies engaged in the same or similar business and similarly situated.

(N) Pursuant to section 260.320.3, RSMo, the executive board ~~shall~~may appoint one (1) or more advisory committees and ensure that the advisory committee(s) meet annually, at a minimum.

~~(O) Planning Requirements. Pursuant to section 260.325, RSMo, the board shall review the district's solid waste management plan at least every twenty-four (24) months for the purpose of evaluating the district's progress in meeting the requirements and goals of the plan, and shall submit plan revisions to the department and council. At a minimum, the executive board shall submit plan revisions by April 1 of each odd-numbered year that include, but are not limited to:~~

- ~~1. An inventory of solid waste services in the planning area on forms provided by the department.~~
- ~~Service information shall include:~~
- ~~A. The solid waste collection services available to residential and commercial customers;~~
- ~~B. The recycling services available to residential and commercial customers;~~
- ~~C. The services available for management of items banned from Missouri landfills, pursuant to section 260.250, RSMo; and~~
- ~~D. The services available for management of household hazardous wastes;~~
- ~~2. Pursuant to section 260.320.3, RSMo, a list of advisory boards, members of each and documentation of meetings; and~~
- ~~3. A description of illegal dumping identification, public education and household hazardous waste activities and programs established by the executive board, pursuant to section 260.320.3, RSMo.~~

(8) Awards.

(A) District Awards. All district ~~grant awards funds are subject to the state appropriation process will be disbursed to the~~. ~~District grant awards will be disbursed to the~~ district as provided for in subsection (2)(C) of this rule within thirty

(30) days of the receipt by the department of all applicable applications and documentation per sections (3), (4), and

(6) of this rule from the executive board of the district. In the case of questions regarding specific costs contained in the district operations application, the funds for costs not in question will be disbursed to the district.

(B) District Subgrantee Grant Project Awards.

1. All district ~~subgrantee~~-grant awards are subject to the appropriation process.

2. Before the districts distribute awarded funds to a ~~subgrantee grantee~~, the ~~subgrantee grantee~~ shall do the following:

A. Obtain all applicable federal, state and local permits, approvals, licenses or waivers required by law and necessary to implement the project;

B. Enter into a ~~subgrantee grantee~~ financial assistance agreement, or an amended ~~subgrantee grantee~~ financial assistance agreement if appropriate, issued by the district which is consistent with the Solid Waste Management Law and department rules and all terms and conditions of the district's financial assistance agreement; and

C. Are in compliance with reporting requirements. Submit all required quarterly and final reports.

(9) Withholding of District Funds.

(A) The department may withhold or reduce district grant awards until the district is in compliance with the following:

1. Solid Waste Management Law and regulations;

2. ~~Planning requirements pursuant to section 260.325, RSMo;~~

3. All general and special terms and conditions of the district's financial assistance agreement;

4. Audit requirements;

5. Resolution of significant audit findings ~~and questioned costs~~; and

6. All reporting requirements ~~and plan revisions~~ indicated in this rule.

(B) The department shall provide written notice of noncompliance prior to the withholding of funds, unless the severity of a significant audit finding requires the immediate withholding of funds. Such notice shall allow a minimum of thirty (30) days for the district to submit the documentation or conduct other tasks as indicated in the department's notice.

(C) If a district fails to submit to the department a complete quarterly semi-annual report, annual report or plan revision by the due date indicated in the department's notice of noncompliance, the department ~~shall may withhold and reallocate funds equal to one percent (1%) hundred dollars of the district's most recent quarterly allocation~~ for each day past the notice due date, unless these provisions have been met:

1. The district has requested an extension prior to the notice due date and the department has granted an extension;

2. The district has submitted a complete report by the date indicated in the department approved extension; and
3. The department shall use the postmark date as the date submitted by the district. If no postmark date is available, the department shall use the date the department receives the report.
  - (D) For ~~questioned ineligible costs identified through the audit process~~ ~~costs that the department determines to be inappropriate or unnecessary~~, the district shall repay the department or the department shall withhold from the district's allocation the amount of the cost, following the department's written request.
  - (E) For funds withheld from a district or repaid by a district, ~~the department shall reallocate~~ these funds ~~shall be reallocated~~ to all districts that, at the time of the reallocation, are in compliance with all requirements and have addressed all deficiencies identified in a district's audit ~~to the satisfaction of the department~~. The reallocation shall be made to districts in accordance with the allocation criteria pursuant to section 260.335, RSMo.

(10) Dispute Resolution. The district and the department shall attempt to resolve disagreements concerning the administration or performance of the district. If an agreement cannot be reached within ninety (90) days of the issuance of the notice of noncompliance, the department's Solid Waste Management Program director will provide a written decision. The Solid Waste Management Program director may consult with the Solid Waste Advisory Board prior to providing this decision. Such decision of the program director shall be final unless a request for review is submitted to the ~~Division of Environmental Quality director~~ ~~Administrative Hearing Commission (AHC)~~ within thirty (30) days of the receipt of the program director's decision. ~~A district requesting AHC review shall follow the administrative procedures of the AHC. The division director shall provide a final decision within thirty (30) days of the receipt of the district's request. A decision by the division director shall constitute final department action. Such request shall include:~~  
~~(A) A copy of the program director's written decision;~~  
~~(B) A statement of the amount in dispute;~~  
~~(C) A brief description of the issue(s) involved; and~~  
~~(D) A concise statement of the objections to the final decision.~~

AUTHORITY: sections 260.225, RSMo 2000 and 260.335, RSMo Supp. 2006.\* Emergency rule filed Dec. 2, 1992,

effective Dec. 12, 1992, expired April 11, 1993. Original rule filed Dec. 2, 1992, effective Aug. 9, 1993.

Amended:

Filed Dec. 14, 1999, effective Aug. 30, 2000. Amended: Filed Jan. 5, 2007, effective Oct. 30, 2007. \*Original authority:

260.225, RSMo 1972, amended 1975, 1986, 1988, 1990, 1993, 1995 and 260.335, RSMo 1990, 1993, 1995, 2004, 2005.

Other comments:

Definitions need to be reviewed.

Top of page 7, C2 solicited vs unsolicited projects. These refer to targeted grants that have been rescinded. Leave in, in case they need these.

Page 8 number E, do not need district administrative grant.

L, State required local match funds.

Terms and Conditions, change 5 year security interest to 3 year security interest.  
Change advisory committee requirement in the law.

## ATTACHMENT D

### DAILY NEWSPAPERS IN MISSOURI

## List of Newspapers That Publish a Minimum of Three Days Per Week

Newspaper	City	Solid Waste District	Email Address	Address	Publish Days
St. Joseph News-Press	St. Joseph	D	<a href="http://www.NewsPressNow.com">www.NewsPressNow.com</a>	825 Edmond Street 64502 P.O. Box 29	7 DAYS
Kansas City Daily Record	Kansas City	E	<a href="http://www.MoLawyersMedia.com">www.MoLawyersMedia.com</a>	405 East 13th Street, Suite 101 64106	7 DAYS
Independence Examiner	Independence	E	<a href="http://www.Examiner.net">www.Examiner.net</a>	410 South Liberty 64050	Tuesday THROUGH Saturday
Kansas City: The Pulse Legal Publication	Kansas City	E	<a href="http://www.PulseLegal.com">www.PulseLegal.com</a>	501 East Armour Boulevard 64109	7 DAYS
Kansas City Star	Kansas City	E	<a href="http://www.KansasCity.com">www.KansasCity.com</a>	1729 Grand Boulevard 64108	7 DAYS
Marshall Democrat-News	Marshall	F	<a href="http://www.MarshallNews.com">www.MarshallNews.com</a>	121 North Lafayette 65340	Monday, Wednesday, Friday
Sedalia Democrat	Sedalia	F	<a href="http://www.SedaliaDemocrat.com">www.SedaliaDemocrat.com</a>	700 South Massachusetts Street 65301 P.O. Box 848	Tuesday THROUGH Saturday
Hannibal Courier-Post	Hannibal	G	<a href="http://www.Hannibal.net">www.Hannibal.net</a>	200 North Third Street 63401 P.O. Box A	Tuesday THROUGH Saturday
Moberly Monitor-Index	Moberly	G	<a href="http://www.MoberlyMonitor.com">www.MoberlyMonitor.com</a>	218 North Williams P.O. Box 697 Moberly, MO 65270	Monday THROUGH Friday
Columbia Daily Tribune	Columbia	H	<a href="http://www.columbiatribune.com/">http://www.columbiatribune.com/</a>	101 North Fourth Street P.O. Box 798 Columbia, MO 65205	7 DAYS
Columbia Missourian	Columbia	H	<a href="http://www.ColumbiaMissourian.com">www.ColumbiaMissourian.com</a>	221 South 8th Street P.O. Box 917 Columbia, MO 65205	Tuesday THROUGH Friday, Sunday
Fulton Sun	Fulton	H	<a href="http://www.FultonSun.com">www.FultonSun.com</a>	115 East 5th Street P.O. Box 550 Fulton, MO 65251	Tuesday THROUGH Friday, Sunday
Jefferson City News Tribune	Jefferson City	H	<a href="http://www.NewsTribune.com">www.NewsTribune.com</a>	210 Monroe Street P.O. Box 420 Jefferson City, MO 65101	7 DAYS

Newspaper	City	Solid Waste District	Email Address	Address	Publish Days
Mexico Ledger	Mexico	H	<a href="http://www.MexicoLedger.com">www.MexicoLedger.com</a>	300 North Washington Street, P.O. Box 8 Mexico, MO 65265	Monday THROUGH Friday
Clinton Daily Democrat	Clinton	J	N/A	212 South Washington Street, P.O. Box 586 Clinton, MO 64735	Monday THROUGH Friday
Rolla Daily News	Rolla	K	<a href="http://www.RollaDailyNews.com">www.RollaDailyNews.com</a>	101 West 7th Street 65401 P.O. Box 808	Monday THROUGH Saturday
St. Louis Daily Record	St. Louis	L	<a href="http://www.MoLawyersMedia.com">www.MoLawyersMedia.com</a>	319 N. 4th Street, 5th Floor , P.O.Box 88910 St. Louis, MO 63102	7 DAYS
St. Charles County Business Record	St. Charles	L	<a href="http://www.MoLawyersMedia.com">www.MoLawyersMedia.com</a>	125 North Main Street Suite 100 St. Charles, MO 63301	7 DAYS
St. Louis Post-Dispatch	St. Louis	L	<a href="http://www.stltoday.com">www.stltoday.com</a>	900 N. Tucker Blvd St. Louis, MO 63101	7 DAYS
Joplin Globe	Joplin	M	<a href="http://www.JoplinGlobe.com">www.JoplinGlobe.com</a>	117 East Fourth Street Joplin, MO 64802	7 DAYS
Monett Times	Monett	N	<a href="http://www.Monett-Times.com">www.Monett-Times.com</a>	505 East Broadway P.O. Box 40 Monett, MO 65708	Monday THROUGH Friday
Springfield Daily Events (Legal Publication)	Springfield	O	<a href="http://www.TheDailyEvents.com">www.TheDailyEvents.com</a>	310 West Walnut Street P.O. Box 1 Springfield, MO 65806	7 DAYS
Springfield News Leader	Springfield	O	<a href="http://www.News-Leader.com">www.News-Leader.com</a>	651 Boonville Avenue Springfield, MO 65806	7 DAYS
West Plains Daily Quill	West Plains	P	<a href="http://www.WestPlainsDailyQuill.net">www.WestPlainsDailyQuill.net</a>	205 Washington Ave P.O. Box 110 West Plains, MO 65775	Tuesday THROUGH Saturday
Poplar Bluff: Daily American Republic	Poplar Bluff	Q	<a href="http://www.DARNews.com">www.DARNews.com</a>	208 Poplar Street P.O. Box 7 Poplar Bluff, MO 63901	Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Sunday
Park Hills Daily Journal	Park Hills	R	<a href="http://www.DailyJournalOnline.com">www.DailyJournalOnline.com</a>	1513 St. Joe Drive P.O. Box 9 Park Hills, MO 63601	Monday THROUGH Saturday
Cape Girardeau: Southeast Missourian	Cape Girardeau	R	<a href="http://www.SEMissourian.com">www.SEMissourian.com</a>	301 Broadway P.O. Box 699 Cape Girardeau, MO 63702	Monday THROUGH Saturday

Newspaper	City	Solid Waste District	Email Address	Address	Publish Days
Sikeston Standard-Democrat	Sikeston	S	<a href="http://www.Standard-Democrat.com">www.Standard-Democrat.com</a>	205 South New Madrid Sikeston, MO 63801	Sunday, Wednesday, Friday
Camdenton: Lake Sun	Camdenton	T	<a href="http://www.LakeNewsOnline.com">www.LakeNewsOnline.com</a>	918 North Business Route 5 Camdenton, MO 65020	Monday THROUGH Friday
Source: Missouri Press Association					